

A  
REJOYNDER  
to Mr. WILLS his *Vindiciæ*:

Wherein  
The Antiquity for Believers, and Novelty  
of *Infant Baptism* is further confirmed.

As also,  
His groundless Appeal distinctly answer'd,  
and the Forgeries and Mistakes boasted of,  
still found to be his own.

*With an Appeal to his Conscience about the same.*

---

*That the words of Tertulian and Nazianzen shew it was  
long before all were agreed of the time or Necessity of Bap-  
tizing Infants before the use of Reason, in case they were  
like to live to Maturity.*

*It was thought his needful to give it [viz. Infants  
Baptism,] a particular express mention in the Records  
and History of the Church [viz. In those times] Mr. Bax-  
ter in his More Proofs, p. 279.*

---

By H. Danvers.

---

*Matth. 5. 11. And shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for  
my names sake.*

*Job 16. 10. They have gaped upon me with their mouths, and have  
smote me upon the cheek reproachfully.*

*Psal. 119. 42. I shall have wherewithal to answer him that reproach-  
eth me, for I trust in thy word.*

---

Printed for Francis Smith, at the Elephant and  
Castle, near the Royal-Exchange, 1675.

# REPORT

TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS SOCIETY

FOR THE YEAR 1917

PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING

Held at the Hotel New York

on the 15th day of May, 1918

at New York City

BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS SOCIETY

FOR THE YEAR 1917

PRINTED BY THE AMERICAN RED CROSS SOCIETY

NEW YORK, N. Y.

# The PREFACE.

**B**EFORE I had finished with Mr. Baxter, I was first assaulted by a new adversary, one Mr. Whiston, and again by my old Antagonist Mr. Wills, not suffering me scarce to take breath, and three to one you know is odd. But bearing, that Mr. H. a meer stranger to me, had undertaken Mr. Whiston, I have obtained so much leisure, to consider what our 3d. Triumvir hath further to say to me. And whom I find upon a serious perusal instead of giving that due satisfaction, my sober Reply, (and all good men) might expect from him for his manifold detestled errors in Antiquity, abuse of Authority, scurrility and indignity to my person (a meer stranger to him) injurious reproaches to the whole party of Baptists, (as well in this as other Nations; not only loading the professors thereof with his slanders, but the profession it self, as leading to Blasphemy and Immorality) is pleased notwithstanding to come forth in this wrathful, self-justifying, and revengeful Spirit, abounding still in his repeated and renewed errors and reproaches; as though an innocent standing by were the best way to defend truth; and to rectify mistake others, the fairest way to clear himself, justifying that Malefactor, who sell foul upon his Prosecutors, Judge, Jury, and Witnesses, as the best way to save himself; And with the Chaced Fox, raiseth a Dust to make his escape. Dealing just with me, as the Heathens did with the Christians of old, putting them into Beards Skins, and then set the Dogs upon them; or as the Papists have done with worthy Mr. Fox for detelling their errors and cruelties, have decry'd him as such a Forger, that none ought to converse with him. But Mr. Wills will find himself under a disappointment, truth is not so to be baffled, nor innocency soil'd, he will yet meet with a

## The Preface.

Vindication of both, in his farther just detection and reproof.

These few Pages therefore do first truly discover to you, notwithstanding the great noise and clamour of mistakes, that the question disputed betwixt us is certainly lost, and given up by him, and that the Antiquity so much boasted of is wholly for Believers, not Infants Baptism. With a serious and particular Answer to his groundless frivolous Appeal: discovering withall, that he is truly guilty of those crimes, and many more, that he would so injuriously father upon me, though what he discovers to have been my errors, I fully own, which are few, and very inconsiderable, mistaking 2 or 3 names one for another, viz. Aquinas for Albertus, Sericius for Hincmarus, not hitting a Popes Name, and not taking Walden to so good advantage as I ought for myself; that of Lanfrank mentioned before, and which are all, of any weight, that I know of, none of them hurting us in the least, and and are so frivolous, that an ingenious man would scorn to have mentioned, much less to have made such a dust about.

But in the mean time I must acknowledge, it is very sad the World should be troubled with such stuff, as though such accusations, recriminations, and discovery of nakedness, was for their edification, which I can truly say is very grievous to me, and were not the truth of God likely to suffer by my silence, I should rather have born his reproaches and slanders, than have made any return to him. And therefore what I have done on my part to prevent such mischiefs and inconveniences, I think will be necessary to give you some particular account of, having before only given you a hint thereof, viz. how much I have endeavoured with Mr. Wills to rectifie mistakes, and mis-understandings in a more Private, Friendly, Christian way, that we might save the world this unnecessary trouble.

Know therefore, that my first Treatise of Baptism, having slept about 12 Months without any publick notice, and being ready to come forth with a 2d. Edition, I improved my utmost

intrest

## The Preface.

interest with all sorts, to procure what Objections did rationally lye against it, that if I had committed any mistakes, I might redifie them, having been constrained to take several things upon Trust, for want of opportunity to examine them by their Originals: And therefore did Apologize in my Preface for Candor, that if by the multitude of Quotations, through so ancient a Track, they might find any particular mistake, mis-quotation, or mis-application, they would not so dwell or insist upon it, as to reject the truth of all the rest, that are full, and clear, and without exception, the way that Carpers and Sophisters take, and the Method that Papists have all along taken in Reply to our Protestant Writers, though did assure, (and so I can say with a good Conscience) that I have not willingly given any such occasion, and truly at last, after all the malicious scrutiny, clamour, and noise that has been made, it is matter of Admiration, that no more has been brought forth: Mr. Wills having discovered but those few before mentioned: Mr. Baxter but one that had any significance: And Mr. Whiston, not one.

Therefore bearing, That Mr. B. had something to say against it, I ventured, as I have told you, to send to him; and understanding, that Mr. Wills had spent sometime in the Oxford Library, to trace my Authorities, and found me tardy in many, I sent Two or Three Messages to him, to admit of some Converse about it, but in vain: then upon the coming forth of the 2d. Impression, I sent Mr. Wills one of them, with this following Letter.

S I R,

I Understand you have some Exceptions against my Treatise of I Baptism, especially the Historical Part, and particularly about the Waldenses, and that you intend speedily to print the same. I having, Sir, printed a 2d. Impression, and therein made some alterations, and very considerable additions, especially as to the Waldenses, have taken upon me the confidence to send you one; and which if it may tend to your satisfaction, may save the world, your self, and me, the further trouble of Answers and Rejoynders, if not, if you will please to Communicate where your principal Objection

## The Preface.

Objection lies, either to that, or any thing else, and admit of the Exchange of a Letter or Two about it; it may not be unserviceable to the Truth, with this assurance; that if it may appear, that I have done any manifest injury to truth, I shall be ready to give the most publick satisfaction it may call for; it having been my earnest and importunate desire, ever since the Exposure of the first, to procure any rational Objection against any thing I had said, and which should have been as wellcome to me as an Approbation, (because it is only truth in sincerity I design to propagate) but do assure you, have not as yet met with the least Objection from any one that I had not before obviated. And indeed as to the Historical Part, though it is not offered for proof, but Illustration only, would be too great folly to render any willful mistake, which every Scholar in his Library confutes; Which with the tender of Christian Respects, is recommended to your Consideration, by

Your unknown Friend and Servant,

H. D.

March 12. 1673.

In which Letter upon the 10th of May 1674, Mr. Wills returns me answer, that had not my Letter come too late, it would have been incivility not to have complied with me; but that part of his Book was in the Press before mine came to his hand, and therefore desired my excuse, and not to reckon him a willing disturber of the world, having never before invaded the Press.

As though my Messages sent to him (by a neighbour of the Devizes, and an acquaintance of his after, that came by him to Bristol Fair, and several speakings to his Book-seller to write to him to that end, who still told me he staid the Press for my second Impression, having been ready for it some months) had no signification, if my Letter had not in time reach'd him, to prevent that disturbance, or at least to have obtained some Civil return from him.

Well, the Book comes forth, and how stuff'd with prejudice, personal Reflections, egregious Mistakes, bitter Invektives not only against my self, and whole Party, but the Principle at self, you are best able to judge; which I endeavour'd some time after, notwithstanding all those high provocations given, modestly to detect in a sober Reply,

Though

## The Preface.

Though by the way this piece of Civility and Ingratitude must not be forgotten, that the week before my Reply was published, they thought meet to put Mr. Wills Title into the Gazette, to proclaim me a Foe to all the Nation over; knowing that though I might follow him in the Press, yet there I was not capable to attend him for my Vindication.

Some months after mine came forth, I heard Mr. Wills was come to Town with a Rejoinder: whereupon I sent some Friends to him to prevail for a Conference with him, which could not be obtained. Then I wrote to some of his Friends to acquaint him, that if he would meet with two or three Christian Friends of a side, and communicate to me his Exceptions, I should assure him, that if I had done him or the Truth any injury, I would make the most publick satisfaction that they should judge requisite: which could not prevail with him. Afterwards I hearing that he had been with my Book-seller, to read some writing of mine respecting the Controversie, which was shewed him, and supposing that might be some obligation to him to be reciprocal, did send my Book-seller to him to obtain the like freedom, to peruse his Papers in his Book-sellers hand, but could obtain no permission thereto.

And yet after the rejection of all these modest endeavours of my part, which bespoke me far from being obdurate or renacious in any thing that I had writ, he has the Considered with this clap of Thunder he has come forth with, to tell the world in his Ep. to his Vindication, That he must acquaint me that I having treated him with so much rudeness in what is past, that he had little heart to have any more to do with me, unless he see better cause, and gives me security of his Silence for the future, to any of my Contradictions, there being no gaping against an oven, and silence is accounted the best answer to such as super-add contumacy to their mistakes.

But where but that Contumacy appeared in me? It is true he deals with me in his appeal as a contumacious person, but

## The Preface.

how such proceedings are to be reconciled to Reason, Rules, or Religion, I must confess myself at a great loss.

Had he dealt with me herein as the Quakers dealt with Mr. Hicks, which he makes his pattern, he had been much more excusable, who (I presume he'll find) admitted of private conference, and had Letters exchanged betwixt them; and till they supposed Mr. Hicks was contumacious, and tenacious, did not proceed in that their Appeal.

I do not know that it is the practice in Westminster-hall, for a Plaintiff to procure publication for Tryal before he gives his Declaration, but his Answer, Reply, Rejoinder, &c. and surely Mr. Wills should have had so much patience to have attended what I had said to his Vindication, before he had thundered out his Appeal: It may be my Answer to the former, might have prevented the latter. Will nothing satisfy him but my utmost shame and reproach? Yet would he persuade the world, That he loves me as a Brother though erring, and had much rather convince then shame me, advising me to leave tossing the Ball of contention, &c.

But is this dealing with me like a Brother he designs to convince and reduce from error? Is this to instruct with meekness? to use any Gospel-way to reform and inform, he knows the Sovereign Rule Mat. 18. is not publickly to tell the Church, till all other private ways are ineffectual.

I must confess these are ways and strains that I have not been acquainted withall, either amongst men or Christians, which only serve as to my own particular to lead me to Christs rule, which I desire more to attend in the case, To pray for him that thus despitefully uses and persecutes me, and to rejoice that I am counted worthy to suffer shame, and to have all manner of evil spoken against me falsely for his Names sake.

Withall satisfying my self that Mr. Wills takes the ready way by these methods to promote the cause he opposes, for few that ever I heard of, that manage a good cause, are left to such foul miscarriages.

H. D.

*The Antiquity of Believers, and Novelty of Infants Baptism.*

**CHAP. I.**

wherein the *Antiquity of Believers, and Novelty of Infants Baptism* is further confirmed; and that the Baptism after Faith was the only Baptism that was owned in the first Centuries, to be Christs Ordinance and the Churches Practice, in full Answer to Mr. Wills his Vindiciæ.

**T**HE main question discussed between Mr. Wills and me, has been, whether the *Anabaptists* (so called) or the *Padobaptists* have most to plead from *Antiquity* for their Way; viz. Those that only Baptize Men and Women after Profession of Faith and Repentance, or those that Baptize Infants that are capable of neither.

The former of which I first asserted in my *Treatise*, and since defended, in my Reply to Mr. Wills, Mr. Baxter, and others, viz. That the *Anabaptists*, notwithstanding the great Cry to the contrary, have the *Antiquity* of their side for the first Centuries.

## The Antiquity of Believers,

And which notwithstanding all the noise and clamour after the full discussion of that point on both hands, is now clearly manifested (if not by their own grants confirmed) to us. The which you may receive in the following brief *Account*.

### CENT. I.

1. Cent.  
gives Ex-  
amples on-  
ly for A<sup>d</sup>  
ult Bap-  
tism.

First it is most manifest as is confess on all hands, that the Scripture Story for the first *Century* gives us an account of no other Baptism, but that after Faith and Repentance, viz. Producess Instances, or gives us Examples only for adult Believers, and not Infants Baptism; As we have observed the *Magdeburgs* themselves those *Pedobaptists* have so fully own'd acknowledging, That they find Examples in the 2, 8, 10, 16, 19. of the *Acts* for the Baptizing of adult Believers, but of Baptizing of Infants they read of no Example De Infantibus Baptizatis Exempla quidem non leguntur: To which Mr. *Wills* subscribes, acknowledging, That there are no particular Examples for Infants Baptism upon Record, p. 3. 53. vind. Mr. *Whiston* confessing the same as generally own'd by them.

As for the Allegation, That the *Apostles Writings* do not expressly exclude Infants, as

Mr.

## And Nobility of Infants Baptism.

Mr. *Wills* and Mr. *Whiston* from the *Stage*, affirm is so weak and frivolous, that needs no Reply, which would establish Baptizing of Bells, Chrysm, and what not of the Popish Inventions.

And that if not asserted in Scripture, is yet found in the Writings of *Origen* and *Cyprian* to have been the *Apostles* practise, is as utterly insignificant, for as it has, and will further appear to you they have writ no such thing; nor secondly if they had, would what they writ in the third Age, upon their single Testimonies, prove such a matter of fact in the first Age, when as 'tis confess'd the Scripture is wholly silent therein.

Therefore I hope it cannot be denyed, that for what appears in Scripture Story, our Enemies themselves being Judges, that Antiquity for the first Century is wholly on our side, so that no mention need be made of the Epistles of *Clement* and *Ignatius* in Confirmation thereof.

### CENT. II.

Secondly, as to the Second Century we find upon the fullest discussion, it produces as few Examples for Infants Baptism, as the first, and that only those are mentioned to have been Baptized in this Age, that first

2. Cent.  
gives Ex-  
amples on-  
ly for A-  
dult Bap-  
tism.

made a profession of Faith, and Repentance, as appears by this most remarkable account given us out of *Justin Martyr's Apology*, the most Authentick piece of Antiquity of this Age (not to mention what is said from *Dionysius*, and *Clement Alexandrinus* Treat. p. 49, 50. which is not gaind by our Antagonist, only Mr. *Wills* would insinuate, that the *Magd.* did suppose, That the Order *Justin Martyr* lays down, respected the reception of Aliens to Baptism, which would not hurt us, because all are Aliens till Converted, no mention being made of any that were otherwise received. But *Justins* own words are full for satisfaction in the point, as Treat. p. 49. viz. *I will declare unto you how we offer up our selves to God after we are renewed through Christ, &c.* Which respected the Order and Method observed by the Saints and Believers in the Church at that day, and how all of them had their admission therein.

So that for the first 300 Years we carry it, having Examples as is confest, for the one, but none to be produced for the other: Whereby I should be sufficiently justified, (should we proceed no farther) in that assertion Mr. *Wills* so complains of, p. 2. wind: By affirming, That Antiquity it self is altogether for Believers, and not for Infants Baptism.

## And Novelty of Infants Baptism.

2

*Answer.* For if it be manifest, that there be 200 Years for *the one* before *the other*, well may I say, That there is *Antiquity* for *the one*, and not for *the other*; for if *Antiquity* be writ upon *Believers Baptism*, *Novelty* then must needs be writ upon *Infants Baptism*. Not but that I grant some that were called the *Ancient Fathers* of the 5th. Age, as *Austin*, *Chrysostom*, and others affirmed it; from whence Mr. *Wills* again and again upbraids me, and Mr. *Whiston* also, That I do contradict my self, in saying *Antiquity* was altogether for *the one*, and not for *the other*, they not considering, or willingly omit that I mean *Primitive Antiquity*; the Elder Brother was to carry away, as the dignity and prebeminency, so the Inheritance from the Younger, much more the true *born*, from the base *born Child*.

## CENT. III.

IN the 3d. Century we have as few Examples to be produced for *Infants Baptism*, as in the two former; but that they Baptized in this Age after the Profession of Faith, we have an ample account from *Tertullian*, *Origen* and *Cyprian*, and several others, as *Treat. p. 51, &c.* And which our Antagonists are so far from opposing, that they abundantly

No Example for any but Adult Baptism in the 3. Cen.

### The Antiquity of Believers,

abundantly confirm, viz. Mr. Baxter, in his *Saints Rest*, p. 1. cap. 8. sect. 5. telling us, That Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, who lived (saith he) in the 2d. and 3d. Centuries, do all of them affirm, That in the Primitive times none were Baptized without an expresse Covenanting, wherein they renounced the World, Flesh, and Devil, and engaged themselves to Christ, and promised to obey him. And Mr. Wills also, 2. part. p. 6. of *Infants Baptism*, acknowledgeth, That the Magdeburgs do tell us, That Tertullian in this age opposed himself to some that asserted Infants Baptism, affirming, That the Adults were only proper Subjects.

So that it is manifest by what appears upon Record from any Authentick Story, that *Believers Baptism* carries the Antiquity of the Third Century also; there being not as yet one Infant upon Record that was actually Baptized, as any Ordinance of Christ, nor any thing appearing from good Authority by any Scripture Argument, that they ought so to be: What is pretended from *Origen* and *Cyprian* you have fully replied to afterwards, and the utter insignificancy of any thing that is urged from them to this end, whilst you have full mouthed Evidence, and undeniable Authority for the other.

# And Propriety of Infants Baptism.

## CENT. IV.

AS to the 4th. Century it doth not yet appear when and where any Infant was Baptized, as an Ordinance of Christ; it is said indeed that some Sick Children were Baptized for their Health in this Age, and that some Dying Children might be Baptized to save them, as some other Dying Persons were; and that some Doctors in this Age inclined from Circumcision to bring it into the Church; but as yet none did pretend it to be necessary, none to have been a Precept of the Gospel, as Dr. Taylor Treat. p. 105. Whereas the Baptizing of Believers after the Profession of Faith, was the general practise of the Age, and which appears from the Three Substantial Instances given by me in my Treatise, especially in the Reply, viz.

From 1. the Sayings of Fathers. 2. Decrees of Councils. 3. Children of Believers unbaptized till aged, p. 4, &c. 1. From the Sayings of the Fathers, and greatest Men of this Century, both in (a) Affrica, (b) Asia, and (c) Europe, asserting the necessity of Confession of Faith before Baptism, both from

Adult Baptism the general practise of the 4th. Age.

1st. From the Sayings of the Fathers.

(a) Athanasius and Arnobius.

(b) Basil,

Nazianzen, Eph. Syrus, Epiphanius. (c) Hillarius, Ambrose, Jerom, Marius Victorinus.

Christ

Christ's Commission, Apostles Praise, and ends of the Ordinance.

Which Mr. *wills* little opposeth, only saith, *That some of these Doctors were corrupt in other things, and so they were all, That some of them 3 or 4 asserted Infants Baptism* which I deny not, to save Dying Children; saith one of them, viz. *Arnobius was spurious from Perkins*; what then? the rest are genuine; and that *Arnobius on the Psalms was ever Doubted in more than I heard before*; but if he was, it signifies nothing; he also *Doubts Basils Proof*, urged by me *contra Eunomium*, which he calls for, and which he'll find l. 2, p. 24. viz. *Baptism is the Seal of Faith, but Faith is the confession of the Doctrines*; for First he ought to believe, and after to be Sealed with Baptism. Doubts whether *Athanasius is rightly rendered*, for which I give you my Authority. *That what is urged for the necessity of Faith to precede Baptism, respected the Adults, very true*; And that some were for the Baptism of Infants, who were not capable to make Confession; very true also; *Si aliquid periculi imminet*, If any danger happened otherwise, the necessity thereof from any precept of Christ was not yet enjoyed.

2. As to the 3 Councils; (to wit the *Constantinian*, *Laodicean*, and *Nicean*) so positively decreeing, That Teaching, Confession of Faith, and free choice, ought to precede Baptism. He saith, That these Decrees respected the Adult; very true; therefore not Infants. Thus the Council of Carthage and Laodicea Decreed also for Exorcism; and giving the Eucharist to dying Persons, and Penance &c. What then, if they were corrupt in other things, were they not right here? Most of the Fathers were for these Corruptions also. And that as to the *Nicean* Council he saith, He had as much cause to question, whether there was any such Council, as I had to question *Cyprian's* Council. But herein he will find himself much mistaken, whilst the *Magdeburg*, *Cen.* 4 c. 9. p. 615. give the Bishops Names who sat in this Council, the time when it sat, viz. Immediately after that of *Armenia*; which *Religious* makes to be about the 10 or 12 of *Constantine*. Together with the 14 Canons of which this is one express at large, and which Dr. Taylor gives us in the *Original Greek*, Determining as he saith, that none ought to be Baptized without giving an account of their Faith, and desiring the same. Whilst Mr. *Wills* can neither produce from any *Antient* and *Authentic* Authority, when, or

2. From  
10 of the  
most emi-  
nent men,  
not Bapti-  
zed till  
aged.

where Cyrillus Council say, or what they decreed or determined in that Council, but what is pretended from that Epistle, which for its corruption is so much questioned, whereof more hereafter.

The 3d. Instance, viz. from 10 of the most eminent Men of the Age, who were not Baptized till aged, though the Children of Christian Parents, viz. Basil, Gregory, Nazianzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerom, Austin, Nectarius, Constantine, Klementin, and Theodosius. Concerning whom, excepting Two of them, viz. Constantine and Austin, he tells me he will not contend with me, but for them he doubts whether their Parents were Christian, yet denies not but that Dr. Taylor and Mr. Baxter may have been of my mind, whilst some others with himself have denyed it, which will be of great force with any considering persons for if they had judged it an Ordinance of Christ, so many of the Chief of the Age would not so have neglected it.

In the next place Mr. VVill. quarrels with some of my modern Authors, who speak the same thing, viz. That in the first times none were Baptized without profession of Faith, viz. Strabo Rheanus, Euphoras, Batras, Dr. Hammond, Mr. Baxter, especially questions Rheanus and Euphoras for Forgery, the first

first, I grant you is not proper to prove only such were Baptized, that remain only being not in us in all the rest, but is no Forgery. As for *Rupertus*, 'tis no Forgery; the Treat. saith, They administred Baptism only to the Children of the Church at Easter; the Reply saith only the *Catechumens*, which as I take it is one and the same, as it respects the Children of the Church, who it seems were not Baptized till aged.

But concerning Mr. B. and my abusing him, respecting his witness, that Adult Baptism was the only necessary. Baptism in these times, take his own words so lately given us in his *More Proofs*, p. 279. viz. *Yet again I will confess, That the words of Tertullian and Nazianzen show, that it was long before all were agreed of the very time, or of the necessity of Baptizing Infants before any use of reason, in case they were like to live to Maturity; for I am perswaded, that the Apostles and first Ministers were so taken up with the Converting of Infidels, Jews and Gentiles, that the case of Infant Baptism was so post-pone'd, and taken up as an Appendix to the Baptism of the Adult, as that it was thought less needful to give it a particular express mention in the Records and History of the Church.*

Mr. B's  
full grant  
against the  
Antiquity  
of Infants  
Baptism.

Thus Mr. *Baxters* own Pen has given himself the lye, and just rebuke for all his vain jangle about the point of Antiquity for Infants Baptism, which now he is thus forc'd to confess there is no express mention in the *Records and History* of the Church for, and so also at once spoil'd all Mr. *Wills* daubery, and silly *Wrangling* about this Point.

Therefore I hope it will not now be denied us that the Anabaptists have the Antiquity on their side, not only for the first 200, but for the first 400 years, there being nothing in the *Records of Church History*, as is manifest, and consent to us also, to prove any *Infant was Baptized*, as a *Church Ordinance*, or that they ought in point of necessity so to be; and therefore there is no cause to question the truth of Dr. *Taylor*, and Dr. *Barlow*'s positive assertions in concurrence herewith, and in confirmation hereof remark'd to us: And it is worthy of consideration, that Dr. *Barlow*, in his *Apological Lr.* printed by Mr. *Wills*, doth not gainsay the Reason and Truth of what he formerly affirmed, but the indiscretion of writing, and unfaithfulness of printing the same.

## C E N T. V.

5. Cent.  
Brings in  
and impos-  
eth the ne-  
cessity of  
Infants  
Baptism.

**T**He Fifth Century, as we have at large proved *Treat. p. 105, &c.* brings in the necessity of *Infants Baptism* to regenerate, take away sin, and to save the Soul of the Infant, and that without which there was no Salvation to be had for them, grounded upon *John 3. 5.* as determined in the *Milevitan*, and afterwards in the *Carthaginian Councils*, by Pope *Innocentius*, afterwards confirmed by Pope *Zozimus*, and afterwards by Pope *Boniface*, &c. Never determined saith Dr. *Taylor*, till the Canon made in the *Milevitan Council*, so saith *Strabo*, *Luther*, *Grotius*, *Treat. p. 107.* which afterwards by degrees came generally to be received both East and West. Yet

w<sup>th</sup> shall

whichall this is most remarkable in the enjoying  
 thereof, that the appointing of *Gossips* to *confirm* *Gossips*  
*Faith*, and *profess* *repentance* in the name and *front* *confirm the*  
 of the Child before Baptism, and the practise thereof *necessity of*  
 of ever since to this our day, was a great *confirmation*  
 Confirmation that the truth of the principle was *before*  
 owned, that Christ enjoined in the Com-  
 mission, requiring Faith should precede, and  
 a Witness of the ancient practise of personal  
 profession in the former Centuries. This In-  
 vention being found out purposely to answer  
 the Commission: And therefore saith *Lud. Vives*  
*l. 1. c. 27.* That none were Baptized of old but  
 those of age, who did not only understand what  
 the Water meant, but desired the same; the perfect  
 Image whereof (saith he) we have yet in our In-  
 fant Baptism, for it is w<sup>th</sup>d of the Infant, wilt  
 thou be Baptized? for whom the Sureties answer,  
 I will. And so saith *Strabo Treat. p. 63.* and  
*Boetius p. 73.* And upon this account both *Au-*  
*stin, Chrysostom,* and the Doctors and Learned  
 Men produced by me downwards through the  
 Papacy to our day, spoke so much (from Christs  
 Commission, and primitive Saints practise) for  
 the necessity of Faith and Repentance before  
 Baptism, only by their Sureties. And there-  
 fore did I so loudly call upon Mr. *Willis* to  
 prove *Gossips* to be an appointment of Christ,  
 or else to allow me all those *Pædobaptists* for  
 proper Witnesses for Believers, and against In-  
 fant Baptism, and to free me from the many  
 Forgeries he loaded me with for the same. But  
 instead of doing himself and me right therein,  
 he only returns thus to me, *p. 45. vind. Mr.*  
*Danvers brings Testimony for Adult Baptism from*  
*Pædo-*

*Paedobaptists*, and it seems a strange design to all that I have spoken with about the same, that he should offer to bring, Chrysostom, Austin, &c. against Infant Baptism, so making the Fathers to contradict themselves, and for which I rebuke him.

Mr. Wells declines answering the material point about Gos-  
pels.

But he takes much pains to vindicate himself, in which undertaking I find him so full of *Memorabilia*, and tedious *Circumlocutions*, that I judge it not worth the while to follow him.

By which his declining to answer so material a thing, we must take it for granted he cannot, and therefore must still apply all those *Authorities* from *Paedobaptists*, even from *Austin* to Mr. Baxter, in full Confirmation of the practise of the *Anabaptists*, in their Baptizing only after profession; and in point blank contradiction to their own practise of Baptizing Infants, who are so incapable either to answer the Commission; primitive Saints practise; or the Spiritual ends of that great Ordinance, and so our whole Witness stands good, as not answered or owned by themselves. As to what he saith respecting those several falsehoods returned upon him; and the absurdities made out against him about Tradition, from p. 51. to 83. I only desire the Reader to examine the shortness and insufficiency of his Answers by the Reply, from p. 29 to 79. it being not worth while to trouble them with his silly wranglings animated by partiality, as Mr. B. phrases it. And it must be remembered to him that as to those Stories about *Jacob & Leyden*, for which he reflected so much obliquely upon the way of *Anabaptistry*; which was returned upon him, and his great error and ignorance in Story evinced with his malicious slan-

ders

and false reports be therein published, not only against the *Method*, but *English Anabaptists* discovered to him: Concerning all which he makes no recant, and whole silence therein must be taken for his guilt, and bound upon him at least till he vindicate himself, or own his folly and injustice. As also in his saying nothing to the Arguments for dipping, against sprinkling or pouring, (about which he has made such a flourish heretofore) is because he be not wholly convinced, yet (as he is usually silenced), and can say nothing thereto.

And lastly, as to what he has said against our Positive Witnesses against Infants Baptism, we must refer him to what is said to Mr. Baxter, after whose Copy he writes, and he having so fully granted us *Tertullian*, and Mr. Baxter having granted as before, that the *Berengarians*, *Wickliffians*, and *Waldenses* were against Baptizing Infants for Salvation, *Manichees* were expressly against it, who were no other than *Muladisers*. The whole of the Book stands yet firm and untouch'd, and most of it confirmed and established by their own Pens.

CHAP.

## C H A P. II.

*Some Objections about Origen and Cyprian, and others, answered.*

1. Obj.

**M**R. Will, tells me, p. 4. That I silently pass by what the Magdeburgs do expressly say was in use in the 3d. age, viz. That adult Persons of both Sexes, and also Infants were Baptized, Cent. 3. c. 6. p. 124.

Answ.

That I have not past it by will easily be understood, when it is considered what I have said to the Authorities they give for the same in the said place, Cent. 3. p. 124. viz. *Origens Hom. on Leviticus, and Cyprians Epist. to Fidus*, neither of which proving, as I suppose, sufficient Authority upon the tryal to make good the same. The Words of the Magdeburgs are these, *Baptizabantur autem in utroque sexu adulti simul et infantes*, That adult Persons of both Sexes and Infants were Baptized. Nam de Infantibus Baptizandis *Origines Homil. 8. in leviticum, Ecclesiam ait traditionem accepisse ab Apostolis: Et Cyprianus l. 3. Ep. 8.* For concerning the Baptizing of Children, *Origens 8 Homily on Leviticus saith, That the Church received it as a Tradition from the Apostles, and Cyprians 8 Epistle in his 3d. Book to Fidus. Contra quod tamen etiam Tertullian censuit in lib. de Bapt.* Notwithstanding *Tertullian thought otherwise in his Book of Baptism, (mind that.)*

The

The Arguments brought from *Origen* and *Cyprian* have been examined at large in my *Treat.* p. 124. to 151. and further in the *Reply* p. 84. to 97. where I prove that of *Origens* to be *Spurious*, and not only that upon *Levit.* and *Rom.* which Mr. *Wills* cannot now deny, [whereby the *Magdeburgs* proof is out of doors] but what he saith also upon *Luke*, with my grounds urged for the same from *Vossius*, *Scultetus*, *Erasmus*, *Dr. Owen*, (1) Because the Original is not extant. (2) Because what is therein pretended from *Origen*, viz. That Children must be Baptized to take away Original sin, (so contrary to his own judgment) he being the head of the *Arrians*. Therefore how fair this is for Mr. *Wills* to boast of this Antiquity, and yet decline Answering to their Arguments, I leave all Men to judge. Who is pleased without any one word of Answer to that which is so positively said to enervate what is pretended for *Luke*, yet in a scurilous and pedantick way to say p. 93 *Vind.* We see by what is said, That we have Infants Baptism owned, as from the Apostles, by *Origen* on *Luke*, what ever becomes in the *Romans*, and translated by *Joan.* &c. So that the *Fabrick* stands yet uprig., never like to be demolished by Mr. *Danvers*, but ever great Exploits he hath done heretofore in the days of his Colleaguiship.

1. *Origens*  
Testimony  
examined.

Concerning which proof from *Origen*, you have *Dr. Taylor* in his liberty of Prophecy, p. 237. Thus, viz. None of the reformed Churches can pretend this Argument for this opinion: Because they who reject Tradition, when it is against them, must not pretend it in the least for them; but if

*D. Taylor*  
sall witness  
against  
*Origens*  
Testimony.

the Topic be allowed to be good, yet how will it be verified? For so far as can yet appear, it relies wholly upon the Testimony of Origen, for from him Austin had it, a Person whom all other Ages have condemned of Errors, and whose works have been judged so spurious. &c.

And that it was the opinion of the Primitive Church, That Infants ought not to be Baptized, is clear, saith he, in the Canons of the Council of Neocesaria, determining, that none ought to be Baptized without giving an account of their Faith, and desiring the same. And agreeable hereto witnessing the the Doctor, spoke fully his own sense herein, take that parallel passage writ in one of his last pieces, in his Dissuasive against Popery, writ 1667. viz. That there is a Tradition to Baptize Infants relies but upon Two Witnesses, Origen and Austin, and the latter having received it from the former, it relies wholly upon a single Testimony, which is but a pitiful Argument to prove a Tradition Apostolical, he is the first that spoke it, but Tertullian that was before him seems speak against, which he would not have done, if it had been a Tradition Apostolical, and that it was not so, it is but too certain, if there be any Truth in the words of Lud. Vives, saying, that anciently none were Baptized but Persons of riper Ages.

2. Cyprian's Testimony further examined.

Then as to Cyprian's Ep. to Fidus, (which is so much lean'd upon, the other proving but a broken Reed.) supposing there was such a Council; (which yet no Author can tell us when, and where held, and what therein determined) and that this Epistle was genuine, (against which I have much to say, Stephens, Dayle, Erasmus, and others proving how much his

his

his Works as well as *Origens* have been abused, and things gathered upon him that were never his ) yet the erroneous grounds upon which Infants Baptism is asserted therein, takes away the *Credit* and *Authority* of the said Council, determining as one well saith *Childrens Baptism, by such Childish Reasons.*

But the matter of Fact say they is clear, which witnessed, that the Church had then such a *practice*, and which all our three Adversaries much insist upon,

As to matter of Fact in Antiquity, ( if this should be granted, of which I see not much cause, for at best it was but advice, and that upon erroneous grounds too, no President as yet appearing in the Case ) it would signifie little to create a *practice* from it. For that Children were Baptized for *heath*, and Church Walls were also solemnly Baptized for dedication, and after that Bells &c. cannot be denied, shall we therefore be warranted to do the like from those Presidents? But in as much as here was no Example, or matter of Fact, nor any advice but upon corrupt and erroneous grounds, this can signifie nothing; the grounds of the advice being rejected by the *Pedobaptists*, therefore the advice it self as to matter of Fact is rejected by them also; all that can be gathered from it, if true, is only that such a Custom was creeping in. We know giving the *Sacrament* to Infants is supposed to be very *ancient* and continued very long in use 600 years, saith *Maldonat* on *Jo. 6.* and that amongst the *Greeks* as well as *Latins*, assisted by *Austin*, *Innocent*, & others, (if not by *Cyprian* also) & that it was *apostolical*, or found

ded upon the Scriptures, but is not that rejected!

But holy Cyprian, saith Mr. Baxter, tells us, as p. 276. *More Proofs*, was an eminent worthy, a great Father and Pillar of the Church, and ought not to be slighted. Yet by his leave Father Cyprian was not Father Paul, nor any Apostle to us, nor doth he give us any warranty from the Word of God, and Christs Precept to ground such a practise upon, but the contrary, and that which *Padobaptists* now a days reject, as very erroneous. And if he tells us, we should do any thing as Apostolical without a word, we must give as little credit to him, as when he tells us, *Chrism* is so, (which the *Magd.* tell us he doth, *Cent.* 3. p. 82. out of Cyprian, l. 1. Ep. 12. though Mr. *Wills* denies the same) or as when he tells us of the necessity of Exorcism, the Authority of Peters Chair, *Alms* to take away sin, that the Administrator gives the Spirit in the act of Baptism, of Rebaptization, by undoubted Councils confirmed, *Perfusion of the Clinici*, *Diluting of Wine*, or mingling Water with it in the Sacrament &c.

I have been the larger upon these Two, *Origen* and *Cyprian*, because my Three Antagonists, and others, do lay so much stress upon them, to prove their Antiquity from, but how little they signifie you now see.

*An Appeal  
to the  
Learned.*

Thus we have ended the point of Antiquity; and which we shall conclude with an Appeal to the Learned of all persuasions, Whether there is not good cause to write Antiquity upon Believers, and Novelty upon Infants Baptism; Nothing more appearing for it for the Four first Centuries, than has yet been brought forth by our opposites. And so much for the Antiquity of Believers Baptism. CHAP.

## CHAP. III.

*Gives answer to Mr. Wills his Appeal in all the parts of it.*

**T**He better to help the *Appellants* (*viz.* the *Baptists*) to give a righteous judgment in the matters brought to their Barr, by Mr. *Wills* in his Appeal: And for the satisfaction of all men, I do hereby joyn issue with him in the candid examination thereof.

*Mr. Wills his Appeal to the Baptists, as you find, consists of 8 Complaints, the which I distinctly answer as followeth.*

1. His first Complaint against me is, For leaving out part of what my Authors say, to make the Sentence more for my purpose; and for which he gives six Instances.

In Reply whereto, I first say in general, That in the quoting of Authors we are obliged to give only what they speak to the thing in hand, without unnecessary repetitions. And therefore Mr. *Wills* in his own case, when I blamed him p. 48. Reply, for leaving out part of that remarkable Sentence out of *Nazianzen*, *viz.* where he brings him to affirm, *That a Child may be Baptized*, leaving out the next words, *si aliquid periculi imminet, si any thing of danger happened;* And in Excuse thereof is pleased

1. Prevai-  
lication,

Answered.  
1. Gen-  
rally.

to

to make the following return *Vind. p. 7. viz.* That I do exclaim against him for Curtailing that Father, but (saith he) the Judicious Reader may understand, that he quarrels at me without cause; for my business was to prove, That Infant Baptism was owned in that Century as to matter of Fact, and not to discover the ground of it, or to enquire in what Cases it was done; and therefore he might have spared his frivolous Charge about that matter.

Which Rule of his own, however it may serve to relieve him for leaving out that passage; (which I doubt, and is not now my business to dispute) to be sure it will justify me in all the 6 Particulars charged upon me under this head. Yet this by the way, as to the reason of his omitting that passage; because, saith he, in the former words the matter of fact is to be made good, (viz. That Infant Baptism was own'd in this Century) is manifest. But he knows the Question is not, Whether an Infant might be Baptized; for at another time he can tell us, That every Baptism is not the Baptism intended, but only that which is done in Christs way in obedience to his Rule. So that if a Child was Dipt, which it might be accidentally by chance, or occasionally upon some emergency, or Medicinally to cure Diseases, (as some were in this Age) or superstitiously to save its dying Soul, which was onely the fancy intended in this place, (and therefore should not have been omitted, for spoiling the scope) it would signify nothing, being no Baptism of Christs appointment, the matter of fact being only to be made out, when the necessity of such a practise  
in

in obedience to Christs Command In performing a Gospel Ordinance is proved. And which Mr. Baxter grants us, was not as yet to be proved by any Church Record; and never till the *Milevisan Council*, with Dr. Taylor.

In the next place, for your better satisfaction, *2ly Partic-  
cularly.* I shall speak to each Particular: And,

First, as to the quotation out of *Daille l. 2. p. 149.* mentioned *Treat. p. 62.* My business was therein to discover, That the Ancients deferred Infants Baptism, therefore I gave the several Instances from him of those who had their Baptism deferred till aged, viz. *Ambrose, Nazianzen, Basil, &c.* who appear undeniably to have been the Children of Christian Parents, and that it was, as he saith, *the opinion of some of the Fathers, That it is fit Infants Baptism should be deferred: And how comes it to pass, that there is not the least tracing or footing of this Custom in the Church of Rome.* Nay, whence is it besides, that they will not so much as endure the very mention of it, and would abhor the Man that should go about to practise it, (the Truth whereof we find also, and feel) &c.

But saith Mr. Wills, *Daille* mentions the deferring the Baptism of other people also, and why did I leave that out? For the Reason Mr. Wills gives, because it was not so much *ad rem*. Though if I had, it would have done him no service, if *Daille* understood himself, who refers us to what he had before spoken about it, which we find in p. 72. where he tells us, *That some were of opinion, That elder People should be deferred Baptism, as well as Infants, agreeing therein, saith he, with the Anabaptists, (which in deed*

deed is our Custom, waiting for fruits meet for Repentance in the first place, so deferring elder as well as younger.

2. The Canon of the Council of Constant. And as to the Second, about the Canon of the Council of Constant. It is not upon search of that though the 2d Chapter, referred to by the Magd. and Mr. Wills mentions no more then what follows, viz. *Si parvulus agrotans ad quemlibet Presbyterum Baptismi gratia de cujuslibet parochia allatus fuerit, ei Baptismi Sacramentum nullo modo denegetur; si quis hoc minus petenti concedere detredaverit, & ille parvulus absq; Baptismi gratia mortuus fuerit noverit ille qui eum non Baptizavit pro ejus anima rationem redditurum.* Yet the 7th. Chapter which neither point to, expresses what Mr. Wills repeats from the Magd. about it; and will shew, it does now appear also, that that 7th. Chapter is one of the 9 *Binus* reckons to be spurious, in these words, *Hi novem sequentes Canones falso adscribuntur sexta Synodo; sed quia pii cum primis esse videntur nolimus curiosam Laetorem eorum cognitione fraudare.* Bin. Tom. 5. p. 361. And therefore upon the whole, though it be sufficient to clear me, that the omitting the exception in that place was not with an intention to deceive, having in my Book twice mentioned it; yet I acknowledge it should have been express, or rather the whole quotation omitted, and do now disown it.

3. That out of Calvin's Institutes.

Thirdly, As to that passage out of Calvin's Institutes, wherein I bring him p. 91. Treat. to confess, That it is no where expressly mentioned by the Evangelists, that any one Child was by the Apostles hands Baptized; which he intimates,

was not Calvin's sense, but express by him to have been the objection of Fools, the which Mr. Will might blush to mention, when he knows Calvin himself to own it as the next words express, viz. *Et si enim id nominatum ab Evangelistis non narratur*, i. e. *For although it is not by the Evangelists expressly mentioned*: And is not that the making it his own? Concluding that their folly only lay in not receiving it equivalent with Scripture, in as much as Infants were not excluded by Scripture, and that whole Families are mentioned to be baptized: And therefore whether Mr. Will did fairly in stopping his Translation where he did (that it might appear to those that understood not Latin to be so gross as he would make it, and thereby render himself to be guilty of the very thing he falsely accuseth me of, viz. To leave out part of the Author, that discovers he speaks quite otherwise than he is made to speak, *Rom. 2. 1.*) is submitted to his Conscience, and the considerate Reader.

Guilt of what he accuseth,

Fourthly, As to what he complains to have been left out in Bellarmin, viz. *That Infants Baptism was to be deduced out of Scripture*, p. 99. And that out of Dr. Field, *That the grounds of it were taken out of Scripture*, p. 135, l. Ed. were also omitted from his own grounds aforesaid: Because I there quoted both of them under the Head of Tradition, (they both with so much positiveness asserting Infants Baptism so to be) yet you'll find, that when I speak to that Head of Consequences from Scripture, I quote them both, as Reply, p. 74.

4th. Bellarmin, and 6. Dr. Field,

And lastly, As to that of Dr. Owen, p. 175.

Lastly, Dr. Owen

which with *Estius*, *Ainsworth* and *Ames*, I brought to prove the Seed of *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 7. respected the Spiritual Seed only, viz. the Elect, who were to partake of the Spiritual Promises, (and not the Carnal Seed, as *Pedobaptists* generally take it,) which the Dr. doth so fully and at large evince: And therefore that Clause he excepts against, was by his own Rule well enough left out, that speaks to another thing. Though I confess, had I suppos'd that the omitting it, would have been any injury to the Dr. or just offence to any man, or any wrong to truth I should have mentioned it; and which I may well do without any prejudice to the cause I maintain. For if I had been to prove that Circumcision, that External Administration of the Covenant which the *Jews* had, belonged to their Carnal Seed, I should have mentioned that; but in as much as the other was the matter in hand, I know not that it was so hainous to omit it, Mr. *Wills* in his own Case being Judge. It is our belief that (as the Dr. says) *the external Administration of the Covenant, viz. Circumcision did belong to Abraham, and his Carnal Seed (the Jews) under the legal Administration; yet it follows not therefore, that Baptism belongs to his Carnal Seed under the Gospel Dispensation.* And therefore the omitting that Phrase, which is not at all disputed betwixt us, could not be from any injurious design. And therefore I conceive I deserve not the severe rebuke, he is pleased to give me for the same, viz. *That I am therein guilty of much dishonesty, and that it is such an unworthy carriage, that he never ob-*  
*serves*

served the like in any man. Though truly if I should have put it in, I know not what advantage Mr. *Wills* could make of it at another time, except he concludes, that the same federal right to the Carnal Seed, is continued under the Gospel, as it was under the Law, and gives the same right to claim the same privileges now, as that did to the *Jews* before: If so, surely *John Baptist* did greatly mistake himself, when he forbade them *Baptism* upon that consideration, & bids them not to say within themselves, that they were the Children of *Abraham*, for that must not now serve their turns, it being only Fruits meet for Repentance, that that must qualify them for the Baptism of Repentance, (and Gospel-Ordinances and Privileges) and not their old Carnal Privilege to be *Abraham's* fleshy Seed, in which they mainly boasted, & wherein they bolstered themselves. And surable he doth Dr. *Owen* himself very excellently tell us in his 6. Exercise, on the Heb. p. 56 Tom. 1. viz.

That the misapprehension hereof was the main thing that confirmed the *Jews* in their obstinacy and unbelief, that being only a peculiar Privilege to that fleshy Seed, for the bringing forth of the *Messiah* into the World, and that when he was come, that Privilege fell, and all Ordinances suited thereto, expired, and new Ordinances of Worship more suitable to the Gospel were appointed &c. That whole Exercitation being written with so much Judgement and Spirituality, I would earnestly recommend it to Mr. *Wills*, and Mr. *Whistons* Considerations, and all other of their minds, who would, upon like misapprehensions, have

have Gospel-Ordinances and Priviledges still entailed upon the fleshly Seed, upon that old federal right which was only Typical, as well observed to us, and done away, (having done its business) when Christ came into the world, that greater Priviledges, and better Ordinances suited to the Gospel dispensation might take place. Jesus Christ as the Dr. so well tells us in his Cat. p. 106. *Requiring Regeneration as an indispensable condition in a Member of his Church, a Subject of his Kingdom: For his Temple is now to be built of Living Stones, 1 Pet. 2. 5. viz. Men spiritually, and savingly quickned, from their Death in sin by the Holy Ghost, (whereof they are partakers) made a meet Habitation for God, Epli. 2. 21, 22. 1 Cor. 3. 16. 2 Cor. 6. 16. & pag. 103. God hath appointed Saints to be the seat and subject of all his Ordinances, having granted the right of them to them alone, 1 Tim. 3. 15. But thus by the By, which may not be unreasonable upon this occasion. Thus I have dispatch'd the first Head, not doubting but I have given ample satisfaction therein.*

*Adding to  
Authors.*

II. His Second Complaint against me is, *for adding to Authors without the Distinction of a different Character, whereof he gives seven Instances.*

*Answer'd,  
1. Generally.*

*This is a Charge that I think may concern most Writers, and 'tis confess'd, that many times it falls out, that through the inadvertency of Writers, or carelessness of Printers, that Quotations out of Authors are not alwayes written in a different Character, whereby the*

*Rea-*

Reader is at a loss many times, whether he reads his *Author*, or another Man, that he refers to : And which is the fault, as Mr. *Wills* knows, of the *Magdeburgs*, of the *Basil* Impression, and the fault of Mr. *Wills* his present Book, which I could abundantly evince, if I would be Critical, and trouble the Reader with such Impertinencies. And wherein any such omission has been in any of my Writings, I can truly say they have not been wilful, but my trouble to find, and of which I shall be more careful for the future, and so will I hope my Corrector. But to be more particular to your 7 Instances, viz,

Those Two added to the *Magdeburgs* are truly their own, though not so immediately following in that Page. That other of *Chrysostom* was purely my own and should have been distinguished. That which he calls my adding to *Jerem*, positively saying they are none of his words, though I tell you, that he saith it is, is Mr. *Wills* his gross mistake; for he will find they are his own words in his *Annot.* upon *Mat.* 28. *Tom.* 9. *Edit.* Paris, Anno 1546. viz. *Non enim potest fieri ut corpus Baptismi recipiat Sacramentum, nisi ante anima fidei susceperis veritatem, i. e.* For it cannot be, that the Body should receive that Sacrament of Baptism, till the Soul hath before received the verity of Faith. That to *Lydia* is not an adding to the Scripture, but my own sense of the words, concluding, that only Believers in her Household were Baptized, of which I speak at large in my Reply, p. 184. That to *Beza's* is easily understood not to be his, by any ordinary Reader. And that to

2. Particularity.



<p>Dan. Treat. p. 194.</p> <p>Dr. Hammond upon Joh. 13. 10 tells us, that Baptism signifies an Immersion, or washing the whole body, and which answers to the Hebrew word <span style="font-family: serif;">בָּרַחַץ</span> used for dipping in the Old Testament.</p>	<p>Dr. Hamonds An. on Job. 19. 101 printed for R. Royston, 1653.</p> <p>The Heb. <span style="font-family: serif;">בָּרַחַץ</span> signifies an Immersion, or washing the whole body, former; (viz. <span style="font-family: serif;">בָּרַחַץ</span>) washing of the whole body, which they call <span style="font-family: serif;">בָּרַחַץ</span> the other (that is <span style="font-family: serif;">בָּרַחַץ</span>) of the hands or feet, which they call <span style="font-family: serif;">בָּרַחַץ</span> feet.</p>	<p>Mr. Will. Smith, char. Dr. Hamonds faith, The Heb. <span style="font-family: serif;">בָּרַחַץ</span> signifies an Immersion, or washing the whole body, which they call <span style="font-family: serif;">בָּרַחַץ</span> the other (that is <span style="font-family: serif;">בָּרַחַץ</span>) of the hands or feet.</p>
--	---	--

And then has the confidence to say, Mr. D. tells us, the Dr. saith Baptism signifies an Immersion, or washing of the whole Body, and answers to the Hebrew word בָּרַחַץ, whereas indeed he tells us, That בָּרַחַץ signifies the washing of the whole Body, and answers to בָּרַחַץ.

Now that this was exactly agreeable to the Dis. Writings elsewhere in the said Book, as well as the truth, the Reader is desired to peruse him upon Mark 7. 4. p. 172. where he saith, That the word בָּרַחַץ (as it differs from בָּרַחַץ v. 3. which belongs to the hands or feet) signifies the washing of the whole body. Thus 'tis said of Expolis (which wrote the Tragedy called Baptes against Alcibiades) that being taken and thrown into the Sea בָּרַחַץ and so the Baptism of

Cups, &c. in the end of this Vase is putting into water all over, rinsing them: Two words there are used by the Hebrews for washing. 1. *YUTIP*, the word used for washing hands and feet only, the other here; And 2. *NIYAD* immersion of the whole body, to which *Barnabas* answers. And upon Mat. 3. 1. p. 14. As the Jews call those Lakes wherein they wash themselves *Washpools*, so in the Christian Church the Baptists, or Vessel which contained the Baptismal Water is oft called *Washpools*, a swimming or diving place. — And further, John in token of the resolved change of the Jews, put them into the Water, and dipt them all over, and so took them out again; And upon the sincerity of their change, promised them remission of sins. And now whether it be Mr. Will or I that have abused Dr. Hamond, is submitted to the unprejudiced Reader.

3. About the Popes Name Deus dedit.

As to the Third I grant, *Deus dedit* appearing to me two words, and not the Name of a Man. I render it in *Deo dant*, or Gods gift, not considering, as Mr. Will observes, that there had been a Rope of that Name, which since I find in the Catalogue of Popes, and therefore acknowledg it to be my error.

4. Quotation out of Walden.

Fourthly, as to the Quotation out of *Walden*, I acknowledge Mr. Will hath truly rectified to our advantage, which confirms more fully, that *Wickliffe*, and his followers, were against Infants Baptism, in agreement with the *Albigens*, and *Sylvest* in Scotland, though different from *Religius* and *Nicemius Victor*, which was my mistake, who (as it is said) held Infants Baptism, and thereby reproved himself for asserting the quite contrary, viz. That *Walden* affirms.

affirms, That Wickliffe held Infants Baptism, p. 45. of his Vind.

The words of Walden relating to Wickliffe are, *Nostri Wicliffite: Baptismum Ecclesiasticum inutile judicant parvulis*, which [ *parvulis* ] Mr. Will's very unworthily leaves out, to insinuate to his Reader, that they rejected all Baptism, whereas that term expressly limits it to little ones; nor can I seriously conjecture, but its rather a *lapsus mentis* then *error Calami* or *Typographi*: Nor does he take notice of the reason assigned there for their denying Infants Baptism, which is the very same Mr. Will's, and those of his mind, produce for its practice, viz. *sufficienter eos aiunt esse mundatos & sanctos, quia de sanctis parentibus & Christianis nascuntur*, i. e. They deem them sufficiently cleans'd and holy, because they are born of Holy and Christian Parents. And now whether Mr. Will's his Curtailing this Quotation, or my harmless and undesigned mistake of asserting Wickliffe to agree with Pelagius be the more blameable, I humbly submit to consideration.

The Fifth is no contradiction, which is only an Allusion to those in Ezra's time that put away their strange Wives, Similies not running of all four, as Mr. Will's would stretch it, 5. That of 1 Cor. 7. 24

The Sixth is no Contradiction, for Infants Baptism might be universally received, and yet in many places little esteemed, has it not been so heretofore here in England, as to that as well as other things I could mention? 1. Because persons may little esteem things they receive. 2. By universal, I explain my self to mean the Greek and Latin Churches, (which admitted of

6. Quotati-  
on out of  
Frank.

of exception) viz. Those that submitted to the Pope; and those that were under the Patriarchs.

7. An Assertion of my own.

The Seventh is no Contradiction, which in the former Chapter I have so fully cleared; there being Antiquity for Believers Baptism in the first Centuries, but no Record for Infant Baptism, as Mr. Baxter grants, in the Church Histories. So that no primitive Antiquity for the same; though the Ancients in after Ages did assert it.

So that what exceptions he has made hitherto, are but slender, and not of that Moment, nor so persisted in, as to deserve an Appeal.

False Translation.

IV. He chargeth me with perverting the sense of Author's by the falseness of Translations; wherof he gives Nine Instances.

Answered,  
1. Generally.

As to Translations, I conceive there is a great liberty allowed, provided the scope and intention of the Author be well heeded; and therefore saith Mr. Marshall in his Defence, p. 16. Translations are various some affect in their Translations to follow their Author *Kata poda*, to have the very foot-steps of the words they translate; other Translations are Metaphorical, or by way of Paraphrase they expound as they translate; thus several men have their several fancies though they adhere to to the Author which they translate, even when they keep not in all things to his words; Jerom gives Instances in the Septuagint translations, whose Testimony I need not name to you, But to the particulars,

As to the first of Bullingers, I did not translate it, but transcribed it word for word out of that Author, called, *A very plain and well grounded Treatise concerning Baptism*. p. 14. mentioned by me p. 9. It is true, I confess, I should have express'd it, or rather have search'd the original my self; and so should Mr. Wallis, when he so mistakenly quoted one from Dr. Holmes, and did neither, and another from the *Magdeburgs* about *Erasmus*. 1. Parties  
larly.  
2. Bullin-  
gers.

As to the Second, about *Nazianzen*, *Baptizandos peccata sua confiteri solitos*, I own it should be rendred, *The Baptized were wont to confess their sins*. Nor did I give it as a translation, *verbatim*; but what I apprehended to be the consequential sence, which I deduce thus: [the *Baptized*] being an indefinite term, and equipolent with an universal, is as much, as if all the Baptized did so; and if all did confess their sins, then none but such were Baptized in the first times, which is concurrent with the sence of so many Authors, so positively affirming the same thing; and if that be not the meaning, I humbly conceive the expression (otherwise understood) may be somewhat impertinent, it being owned of all hands, that the Adult in all Ages so to do. 3. Nazian-  
zen.

The Third is of *Olympiodorus*, a meer quibble, and catching at words; the word [Born] by the words going before, *viz.* *Spiritual* Ele, being easily understood to be [born again] however the word [again] came to be omitted. 3. Olympi-  
odorus.

The Fourth of *Albertus*, is of like Import; for if Baptism cannot through the incapacity of the subject operate upon them, it may be truly said 4. Albertus

said in a Paraphrattical Translation, That it is not proper to admit Infants thereto: For if it cannot operate in any other but the Adult, who are illuminated and called, who can draw Virtue from Christs Death and Resurrection; then Baptism not proper for other.

*g. Albinus.* Neither is the Fifth from *Albinus* ill rendered or perverting the sence if you take the scope, and former words, which speak the thing he excepts against; and which Mr. *Wills* leaves out, a liberty being granted to paraphrase, keeping to the sence, though contracting the words.

The Sixth is no perverting or mis-representing the *Magdeb.* in saying, They tell us, That in the latter end of the Fourth Cent. they Baptize Children, giving it from the testimony of *Asbanasius*, who writ in the latter part of the 4th. Cent. That *Contra Arianos* being writ, as saith *Helvicus*, Anno 360 But I have since made appear, that the *Magdeb.* tell us therein an untruth; for that pretended account was from *Asbanasius's* supposed Questions, which they themselves afterwards confess to be spurious, as I have told Mr. *Wills*, and he confesseth to be true, and therefore wonder, that he should have the Confidence to put this under the notion of mis-representation, or mis-translation, it being neither. Had I given a translation of the former part of the sentence, respecting *Origen* and *Cyprian* ( before, refuted by me, and which I concern'd not with my self, then ) and not rende'd [ in *Ecclesijs Africanis* ] in the *African Churches*, there might be some ground of Cavil; but whereas I did not, I hope I may be excus'd. The words are, *Hoc vero seculo ex-*  
dent

dem [ viz. Baptismum ] durasse ex Athanasio constat, quest. 124. i. e. It appears from Athanasius 124 question, that is ( viz. Infant Baptism ) was in this Age. So that what I say respects the time, and not whether all or part of the African Churches. But if to say in the African Churches they Baptized Children, pleases Mr. Wills, I am contented it should be so; and let him make the most of it.

The 7th. concerning the Milevitan Decree, viz. That first part of the Canon, *That all that affirm, that young Children receive Everlasting life, albeit they be not by the Sacrament of Grace or Baptism renewed.* I made it not, nor abused that Council, nor mis-translated their words, for in the Verse before going, as the Magdeburgs express it, p. 835. they represent the crime of those they censure in these words, *Non opitulari parvulis ad consequendam vitam Aeternam Christiane gratia Sacramentum*, viz. *That the Sacrament of Cristian Grace (or Baptism) profits not little Children to Everlasting Life.* The same also is express'd by the whole Council to Innocentius, in their Synodical Epistle, p. 842. in these words, *pueros quique parvulos si nullis imponentur, & gratia Sacramentis, habituros vitam Aeternam.* The same is also in Innocent's Decretal Letter, p. 845. which he returned to the Council in these words, *Illud vero quod eos vestra fraternitas asserit predicare, parvulas Aeternae Vitae praemij, etiam sine Baptismatis gratia, posse donari persatium est;* And to mix with those Hereticks, (as they counted them) was the decree I mentioned, made, and which is to be found in Regia Collect, Tom. 4. p. 459. immediately after the words recited

7. About  
the Milevitan  
Canon,

by Mr. Will's *ex Pervertitis codices*, out of a very ancient Copy, thus. *Item placuit, ut si quis dicit ideo dixisse Dominum, in domo patris mei mansiones multe sunt, ut intelligatur quia in regno Celorum erit aliquis medius, aut ullus alicubi locus, ubi beate vivant parvuli, qui sine Baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt, sine quo in regno Celorum quod est vita aeterna intrare non possunt Anathema sit*; and which is the very thing I affirmed: and therefore I hope will justify me from this Charge, giving onely an Epitome, and not the whole of the Decree, out of the Decretals themselves, nor the *Magdeburgs*. 'Tis true, the Canon has not this *Appendix* to it, where recited by the *Magdeburgs*, nor in *Reg. Collect.* p. 362. though properly belonging to it; but where the *African* Canons are collected, repeated, and confirmed under *Celestinus* Pope, and *Theodosius* Emperor, Anno 424. it is annexed. And then this 2d. Canon of the *Milevitan* Council, with this annexed, is made the 77th *African* Canon. And I must further inform the Reader, that the *Magd.* confounded these two *Milevitan* Councils together, putting the latter, which was in the year 416, under the year 402. which was the first *Milevitan* Council in *Numidia* in *Africa*; and both held under *Innocent* Pope, and *Theodosius* Emperor; which mistake is taken notice of in *Regia Collectione*, with the grounds thereof. And in p. 541. you'll find these words beginning the Collection, *Sequuntur Concilia Africana sub Innocentio habita*; which includes the Canon I cite in p. 559. aforesaid.

That the 8th. is no mis-representation, in saying, That *P. Innocentius* attributed divine Hon-

ours

F. About  
P. Inno-  
cent's Blas-  
phemy.

now to the Popedom, will be easily conceived, inasmuch, as he singled out Peter, and attributed Divine Honour to him, put confidence in him, and desired help from him in conjunction with God himself; and whether he did it as to Pope Peter, or St. Peter, is not much material, the former is probable. And therefore doth Fox 2 Vol. p. 1020 &c. tell us in how many things the Popes blasphemously match themselves with God himself.

The 9th. out of Vossius, giving the Reasons from the Ancients, why they Baptized Men and Women naked, is a full and clear Translation, as fully made good from those particular Instances given out of Vossius from Cyril, Chrysostom, Cretensis, Anselm, Ambrose, &c. his being a miserable trifle in his Appeal to the Reader, whether the Reasons given, were not because their naked Bodies were to be Baptized, and not the Cloaths, as I ignorantly (as he saith) affirm, whereas I give those Reasons, why they Baptized their naked Bodies, and not the Cloaths, viz. That they might be, as in the state of Innocency; and as in their first Birth, and as they expect to be in Heaven; or as Christ was nailed to the Cross. From the Ancients, which they expressly make out in p. 32.

Therefore it is left to the Reader to judge, where there is the least mis-representation, or false Translation in all these Particulars, and what cause to make an Appeal for the same.

V. The Fifth thing he complains against me for is, For fathering upon Authors that which they indeed say not, as least in the place, by me quoted; whereof he gives 8 Instances.

Answered,  
1. Quota-  
tion out of  
Luther.

The first as to a Quotation out of *Luther de Sacrament. Tom. 3. fol. 168.* I transcribed it out of the same Author before mentioned, *the plain and well grounded Treatise*, p. 25. I have since examined that *Tom.*, but cannot there find it; supposing, they either misquoted the *Tom.*, or else quoted it out of another Edition, concluding, so large a Quotation was not fathered upon him, he speaking much that Language in other places.

2. Out of  
Basil.

To the Second, as to the Quotation of *Basil, contra Eunom.* who only say, That he saith, *lib. 3. This Baptism is the Seal of Faith.* But he will

\* Nam *cre-* find the rest of the Sentence in that Book of  
*dere prius* Basil they refer to; viz. *lib. 3. p. 84. Baptism is*  
*oportet ac* the Seal of Faith; but Faith, the Confession of the  
*postea Bap-* Deity: for first be ought to believe, and after to be  
*tismate de-* sealed with Baptism. \*

3. Magdeb.

To the Third, where he saith, *That the Magdeburgs do not say, it was the universal practise to Baptize the Adult under the 4th. Cens. as I affirm they do.* I say, That I have made it appear, they do by those Instances mentioned by them, from the sayings of the Doctors, and the Decrees of Councils, that Decreed only for Adult Baptism; and for which, I refer you to the former Chapter for further proof, that I did not mis-represent them therein. If I speak their Sense, though vary in words, and contradict what they say at large, I do them no injury. But so they do express it.

4. Arno-  
bius,

To the 4th, That I quote *Arnobius*, a spurious Author, whilst I blame him for such, and which I say, I take out of the *Magd.* whereas the *Magdeburgs* have it not.

To

To which I say first, I do not know, that *Arnobius* upon the *Psalms*, is a spurious Author, should I have quoted him out of *Perkins*, who (Mr. Will's saith) tells us, it is spurious; as he did *Athanasius's* questions out of the *Magdalen*, which they said was so, I had been lyable to like Reproof. Neither 2dly. did I say, I took *Arnobius* out of the *Magdeburgs*; I said the *Magd.* did give some of those that followed, not all, he being mentioned upon the 146. *Psalms*, and not from any Book or Page in the *Magdeburgs*.

The Fifth, it is true, is a mistake as placed by the Printer, but not intended, as easily discern'd by the Reader, being put down as an additional Proof out of *Albertus*, having Inserted 3 before, the Printer putting *Aquinas* before the last of them, and so made that which I had put, viz. [And again] to belong to *Aquinas*, and not to *Albertus*. Which Venial mistake he makes equivalent with that grand one of *Basil* for *Natanzan*, which he so egregiously abused me for, and boasted what great acquaintance he had with Father *Basil*, putting it down as a great remark 3 several times: This of mine being a proof for him, viz. to prove Infants Baptism; therefore it matters not much, whether from one or the other, they both speaking the same thing, that of his, wholly against me.

4. Out of *Aquinas*.

NO. 2.

6. Out of the *Magd.*

7. Out of *Vossius*.

As to the 6th. the *Magd.* tell us, That Infants as well as the Adult, were Baptizet; and instance onely in a Queen then Baptizet, whom *Zonaras* calls *Rossiorum Regina*. And that's all (I confess) that *Zonaras* is concern'd in it.

The 7th. is such another trifle. I say, *Perkins* saith, *Vossius*,

## Mr. Will's Appeal answered:

saith, ( for he was a Collector from Authors ; and those he quotes, we may in propriety of speech attribute to him ) That *Nestarius* was made Bishop of *Constantinople* betore he was Baptized, he says, he was but appointed so, the stress of the proof lying, That he was a Believer at age before he was Baptized, there being no such great difference, betwixt being made and appointed Bishop in the Case. And *Beza* there gives instances, not of obscure persons, but of persons, as he says, that had the eyes of all upon them Baptized at Age, viz. *Constantine*, *Nestarius*, and *Naxianzen*.

8. One of Mr. B. The 8th. is muchlike his fellows, in a Quotation from Mr. *Baxter*, proving against the Popish Doctrine, *ex opere operato*, to work Grace by the deed done, I brought him to say, That Baptism of it self cannot give Grace or Regeneration, nor can work any such cause ; for *Water*, he saith, is not a subject either capable of receiving or conveying Grace to the Soul. But he saith, I abuse Mr. *Baxters* words, who saith, That Baptism can be no such cause, whereby I do, as he saith, attribute Non-sence and Absurdity to him ; and that there is neither Innocency nor Truth in so affixing it. If to work no such cause, be such an error, it is a venial one, and I can say, not wilful ; but certainly this Man would make notable work with me, if he had matter to work upon. But what just cause of Complaint or Appeal in all this, I profess seriously, I see not.

Displacing  
Quotations

VI. The 6th is, for picking out of Authors here and there, and joyning them together, as if they were one intire Sentence, whereas he gives four Instances. To

To the 3 first, viz. Mr. Baxter, Dr. Owen, and Dr. Taylor, I say, I have put down nothing but their own, and what is congruous, one thing answering properly and naturally with another, which if it did not, we should, I presume, have heard of.

And for what relates to himself, which is the 4th. I have done him no wrong, the Pages mentioned by me, viz. p. 36, 38, 101, 131, 132. I have particularly examined, and desire the Reader so to do; and let him judge betwixt us, whether he doth not in those Pages compared again and again say, *That as there is no Scripture expressly commanding, so neither is there any Scripture excluding Infants from Baptism, nor any Scripture that saith, there was no Infant Baptized,* each Page I would have put down, but that I would not burden the Reader; which you find express by me in my Reply, p. 63. and the several Pages particularly express, I refer to. And what good cause is given to complain of me in this, I see as little as the former.

VII. The 7th. is, *for asserting notorious untruths,* Notorious untruths.  
giving Instances of Eight.

The first for affirming, *That Antiquity is self,* 1. Answered.  
*so much boasted of, is altogether for Believers,* id.  
*and not for Infants Baptism, an Assertion, as he* 1. About  
*saith, so notoriously false, that I have confuted my* Antiquity  
*self in owning the ancients asserted it.* for Infant  
Baptism.

This is already answered again and again, I hope to satisfaction, viz. *That primitive Antiquity is only for Believers, and not for Infants Baptism; and the Ancients in latter, not former*

B. About  
Christning  
a Dead  
Child.

former Centuries, *only for Infants Baptism.*

The Second for saying, *That a Child that dyed unbaptized, was taken up and Christned, putting in the Margent a dead Child Christned; the Boy was not taken up and Baptized Dead; but after he came to life again, he was Baptized.*

In the first place, I conceive there is no untruth in my rendring the words, *Is puerum sine Baptismo mortuum resuscitavit ex mortuis, & tandem Baptizavit, That a Child that dyed unbaptized, was taken up and Christned; being not exclusive of the sence Mr. Wills would have it bear.* But 'tis the Margent that saith, [*a dead Child Christned*] he mainly quarrels at, which indeed is wholly mine, and therefore my sence or explanation of my own words, is to be received, which admits of a Two fold, or double Interpretation, *viz.* either that Child that was Dead, now Christned, and so not to be blamed in Mr. Wills own sence: Or if I should intend the Child then dead when Christned, I know no reason, but I may have my liberty of Conjecture, as well as Mr. Wills: And the rather, because, though *resuscitare* be generally understood, *to raise to life*, yet the phrase here, may, without any such palpable absurdity, be understood, *a taking up from among the Dead, or out of the Grave; especially, because such an Interpretation so exactly agrees with their (then usual) practise to Baptize the Dead that dyed unbaptized; which certainly is more likely, and far more agreeable to truth, then that such a Miracle was wrought of raising to life.* Besides, why may not the Dead be sometimes used for the Grave, as the Grave

As often (Metonymically) used for the Dead, and Death? as I could instance with great variety, had it been necessary. So that this latter (should I persist in it) is so far from being blameable, that it is indeed very probable; and therefore Reader, take it which way you will, no such notorious untruth as he talks of can hence be justly chargeable upon me.

The third notorious untruth he saith I assert, is from the *Magdeburgs*, Cent: 13. p. 419. viz. That the Magd: do say, that as to the form of Baptism, Guelicmus added to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the Virgin Mary. viz. I baptize thee in the Name of the Omnipotent Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the Blessed Virgin Mary; which saith he, is another notorious untruth; for the *Magdeburgs* say nothing of the Virgin Mary, but which of us speak truth, let the Reader judge: The words of the *Magdeburgs* are these in the Cent: and p. above said, viz. Male Guelicmus ad Formam Baptismi addidit Mariam. Baptizate in Nomine Patris Omnipotentis, & Filii & Spiritus Sancti, & Beate Mariz Virginis. De Bapte: & eius part. c. 2. Magd. Cent: 13. c. 419. a: c. Guelicmus wickedly added Mary to the form of Baptism: I Baptize thee in the Name of the Omnipotent Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the Blessed Virgin Mary in his name of Bapt: and its parts. Therefore if this be not plain & ceterity, I know not what is.

1 About Guelicmus Blasphemy.

2 About the Donatists.

To the 4th, that the Donatists were against Infant Baptism, which he saith is as true, as that a Dead Child was Baptized, and that Pope Innocent was the first Invention of Baptism; and finally, altogether for Believers, and not for Infants Baptism.

4 About the Donatists.

H

VVhat



first respecting Transubstantiation, the 5th and 6th Articles Baptism, and Marriage; then superlatively raising my Eye to the end of the Story, I found it said, *ad quod in his sedibus apostolicis Doctrinae perpetuae et inflexibilis Ecclesiae Dei, Testes s. b. and 6th. beatus apostolus* the perpetual and agreeing Doctrine of the Church of God; Quorin? Lausfrank of the Sacraments, and his Book de Sacram. concluding in this respect those 5 or 6 Particulars before mentioned, but afterwards examining it with the most faithful Friend, I found that those 5 or 6 Particulars did not include those first mentioned, but were 6 other Particulars discussed about Transubstantiation, betwixt Lausfrank and him. Yet this I must remark by the way, that though I mistook my self in this, yet the rest of my Testimonies to prove Berengerius did deny Sacramental Baptism hold good, as you'll find before in p. 22. 2d. Rep. Guttmund being one of them, who asserts that he did affirm Baptism did not profit little ones.

207  
208  
209

7. As to the Canon of Illerdon in Spain, I quote it out of the Dutch Book of Martyrs, for which they Cite their Authorities at large, page 189. I seek. And if they have mistaken it, let them be accountable for it, and me, no more than Mr. Willems desires to be, for quoting the Mass longer in their mistake about Eucharist.

210  
211  
212

8. Amongst my notorious untimely he puts my calling Circumcision a legal Ordinance, which he saith, it was instituted 400 Years before the Law. When there? so were Sacrifices 400 Years before, & 1000 Years they not therefore legal also, being enjoined by God as well as the

213  
214  
215

the other under the Law, and therefore with-  
 said of Circumcision, though of the Fathers, yet it  
 was given by Moses, John 7. 22. and which was  
 so legal, that it bound to the keeping of the  
 whole Law, Gal. 2. 3. and so typical and sha-  
 dowy, that it was to be done away when  
 Christ came, Gal. 2. 2. and of such great stress  
 that there was no entering into the Jewish  
 Church without it, & whoever eat the Passover  
 uncircumcised must be cut off. And that  
 the Pædo-Baptists Arguments from Circumcisi-  
 on are begged, not proved. See my Reasons  
 pp. And how all my Arguments are begg'd  
 or stollen, is begging still till proved, which  
 will be best understood by this Answer, to  
 which these are referred.

Sericius,  
 for Hinc-  
 marus.

8. The mistake of the name *Sericius* for  
*Hincmarus* I own; but what Decrees were made  
 by P. *Sericius* so immediately proceeding Immu-  
 nization for Infants Baptism as Mr. Will suppo-  
 seth, I find not; when he produceth them I'll  
 blot out *Innocent*, and put *Sericius* the first Im-  
 pposer of it.

Swange  
 Doctrines.

VIII. The last he changes is strange Doctrine.  
 The first for calling the National Church of the  
 Jews, made up of the Carnal Seed, a Carnal  
 Church, who had Carnal Ordinances, which he  
 saith, is Blasphemy to affirm. But that Blasphemy  
 the Holy Spirit will accuse me of, whilst  
 he calls their Ordinances of their Church by  
 that Name; and what Saint Mr. Will gives for  
 their Ordinances, will serve for the Church of  
 so which I to be understood (Gal. 2. 2.) Compar-  
 atively; and so lay I to the more Spiritu-  
 Church

Answered.  
 1. About  
 the Jewish  
 Church.

Church and Ordinances in the New Testament.

But that Baptism doth as much take into the carnal seed in the Gospel Church, as circumcision under the Law, is I presume Mr. Williams strange Doctrine, God enjoining the Intemperate or Carnal Seed to be circumcised, but hath he not that under the Gospel they should be baptized: and touching which I refer you to Dr. Owen for better Information, as before.

2. False Doctrine, That I do with Dr. Taylor say, Infants have neither Habitual nor actual Faith, nor are Disciples of Christ, and incapable of Regeneration, so consequently of Salvation.

That they are incapable of that Faith and Regeneration spoken by James 1: 18: 1. Pet. 1: 2, 3. John 1: 12, 13. And as Dr. Owen has defined Regeneration is all I say, viz. begotten by the Preaching, Hearing, and Receiving of the Word, renewed in knowledge, changed and converted thereby, is all that I affirm, page 113. That they are capable of Salvation by Christs purchase and the Application of his Blood and Spirit to them, who doubts it? I am sure I never affirmed the contrary.

3. The next false Doctrine is for affirming, Baptism nothing to be a Seal of the New Covenant, but the Holy Spirit, a strange Paradox! But when Mr. Williams, or any body else proves the contrary, I shall be content to alter my judgment.

4. That Infants are neither capable of personal Duties, nor enjoy Privileges, viz. Church privileges, as I have sufficiently explained my self page 1. viz. Baptism, Lords Supper, Hearing the Word, Church membership, &c.

About Infants Faith and Regeneration.

Baptism as a Seal. Infants capacity.

3 About  
Baptism.

4 New Test.  
Church.

7 About  
the Order  
of Baptism.

6. For *Pointing Baptism* is in the *gathering* of  
members, viz. in *Jesus* *same* *time*. The first en-  
trance into the Church, where the Holy things  
in Christs order and way are duly administered;  
not in the Popes sense of Sacraments. (1 Cor. 11)  
6. That the New Testament Church is by Oblivion  
apartments be a separated people, consisting only  
of the Spiritual Seed of Abraham; but the flesh,  
Hypocrites and wicked persons are in it. But whe-  
ther will he call that Christs, or the Devils ap-  
pointment? who tells the Tares? of which  
Point Dr. Owen has well spoke, to whom I re-  
fer him as before.

7. That the Mystery should go before the Sym-  
bol. Had Mr. W. represented the quotation  
truly, the very perusing it would clear me from  
this charge; but he (very unworthily) leaves  
out the Parenthesis which explicates the ex-  
pression, and without which the words seem  
to import a harsh Doctrine. The words are,  
If the Mystery goes not before the Symbol;  
(which it does when the Symbols are con-  
signations of Grace, as the Sacraments are.)  
[this Parenthesis he leaves out] yet it  
always accompanies it; but never follows in  
order of time. I do not deny but a man may  
be Baptized if he professes Faith and repen-  
tance though not in truth, and in him the Mys-  
tery goes not before the Symbol; but coming  
afterwards really to believe and repent, it may  
follow in order of time. but then the Symbol  
to him when Baptized was no consignation of  
Grace. And now let the world judge whether  
Mr. W. speak honestly in skipping over those  
words which were laid in on purpose to shew

as such a Devil as he makes; he may be truly  
said to him, that if he cannot find a Heale, he'll  
make one.

8. No visible Church-member before Conversion  
whom I say none ought to be so, and so such  
Dissension.

9. That I make a Believer and Dipping to be  
the right matter and form of Baptism; which I  
have proved against Mr. Blinman, and neither  
by Mr. Williams nor him yet answered.

10. That nothing but the Fruits meet for Re-  
pentance, can give right to the baptism of Repen-  
tance, and nothing more of the Spirit which can ar-  
rady admit to Water-Baptism, and Spiritual Ori-  
ginates; a Doctrin apparently false, instancing in  
John, baptizing the Jews upon confession of sin  
and repentance, which was not Fruits, and the  
3000 Baptized, Acts 2. And were they not  
pricked at heart, and received the word gladly,  
and confess Christ to be the Messiah, whom they  
had so lately before Crucified as a Blasphemous  
and were not those Fruits meet for Repentance  
and anenment of life &c.

### THE CONCLUSION

Thus I have given a Candid return to each  
Particular charged in this Apology, publick-  
ly acknowledging what of Error or Mistake I  
am convinced of, and justifying my Innocency  
and Integrity in the rest, for as yet I see cause  
to own no more (nor accounting a few Inma-  
terial over sights which Ingenious men would  
need to dwell upon) than the still naming two  
or three, viz. Apology for Absentees, Apology for  
Baptism, not fixing the Pace One year,  
&c. and not taking a Quotation out of

8. About  
Church-  
Members  
Baptism

9. About  
the matter  
and form  
of Baptism.

10. About  
receiving  
to Baptism.

Walden to so good advantage as I ought, that of Austin 3 and 4 Book being left out, Lanfrank being before owned to Mr. Baxter.

Concluding that as none of which can be supposed to be wilful, so neither can there be any obstinacy in the Case, having never heard of them before.

Therefore upon the whole, I joyn issue with Mr. Will, freely submitting it to the Bar he has brought it; not doubting upon the due examination of his Complaint, and my defence, that if they find me guilty of the Crimes he lays to my Charge; but they will, as he desires, discharge duty to me as becomes them, to bring me to the acknowledgment of my evil, or to disown me if obstinate, as a person unworthy to be countenanced amongst them.

But if on the contrary Mr. Will's Appeal appears to be faulty, and the Particulars thereof not true, then that his said Appeal shall, as he desires, as unjust, reflect the blame of the charge upon himself, according to the righteous Law of the Lord.

Deut. 19. 16, 17, 18, 19. If a false Witness rise up against any man, and testifie against him that which is wrong, then both the men before whom the Controversie is, shall stand before the Lord, and the Judges which shall be in those days. And the Judges shall make diligent inquisition, and behold if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his Brother, then shall ye do unto him as he had thought to have done unto his Brother: So shall thou put the evil away from amongst you: And those that remain shall hear, and fear, and shall henceforth commit no more any such evil among you.

## CHAP. IV.

### *An Appeal to Mr Will's Conscience.*

Sir,

**I** Having at your *Groundless* and injurious summons, given this full *Account* of my self, in my just *vindication*: And so far as I am *convinced* made (as you charitably suggest I would, *Pres. App.*) a *Candid* and publick acknowledgment of what of *error* or *mistake* is made out against me by your self or others, may therefore with more freedom *apply* to your Conscience herein, especially since I offer you *nothing*, but what I conceive carries demonstration with it, and back'd with *Scripture evidence*, for your better consideration and conviction.

Therefore in the first place, I desire you to consider, whether you are not notoriously guilty of *Back-biting*, by taking up reproaches from others, and *Tale-bearer* like, spreading and publishing the *same* to the defaming your Neighbour, without enquiring into the Truth thereof from himself: nay, refusing all due *information* and *satisfaction*, when friendly tendred to you.

For, have you not taken up these following things upon report and *Hear-Say* from others; against one that is a meet stranger to you, & published the same to my disgrace, to promote thereby your Cause, &c.

First, That, as you have heard, *I own not so much Scholarship to compose such a Book, though my*

*1. Reproach  
full Back-  
biting.*

# An Appeal to M. Wills Conscience.

solitary life has given me opportunity enough to study, Pref. Inf. Bapt.

Secondly, That I have only fixed my Name to the Book, that another chiefly has most Reason to own himself to be the Author of, Pref. Ibid.

Thirdly, That, as you have heard, I have Inion like, slain in love with my own shadow, puffed up with the Excellency of my own performance, Ibid.

Fourthly, That I am a very tenacious Person, as you have heard, Vind. P.

Fifthly, That I am fain to call in the Wits of our Party, to help me to deal with you, Pref. Vind.

Sixthly, That I am of a Self-conceited-scornful Genius, unbecoming a Christian, Infants Bapt. 2 p. 86.

Seventhly, Insinuating that I am of such a (pugnacious or) fighting temper, that though my hands are tied behind me, yet will do it with Tongue and Pen, Pref. Inf. Bapt.

But, how agreeable such actings are with the following Scriptures, I leave you to judge.

Exod. 23. 1. Thou shalt not receive a false Report: Put not thy hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous Witness.

Levit. 19. 16. Thou shalt not go up and down as a Tale-bearer among thy people.

Psal. 15. 3. He that back-biteth not with his tongue, nor doth evil to his Neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his Neighbour.

Prov. 18. 8. The words of a Tale-bearer are as wounds, &c. 20. 10. Where no Tale-bearer is, the strife ceaseth.

Jer. 20. 10. I have heard the defamation of many Report, say they, and we will report, &c.

And to these add the Golden Rule, so highly in-

infringed thereby, Math. 7. 12. Therefore all things whatsoever you would that Men should do unto you, do even so unto them, for this is the Law and the Prophets. And would you be so dealt with by me and others, ask your own heart? Pray, read Mr. B. Rules to this Point, in his *Christian Directory*, some of which are given you in p. 158. 2. Reply. And amongst the rest, this is one:

If you know it not to be true, or there be no sufficient evidence to prove it, you are guilty of lying and slandering interpretatively, though it should prove true, because it might have been a lye for ought you know.

Secondly, are you not evidently guilty of Bitter Scoffing and Reviling both Person and Book, and notoriously guilty of Railing.

1. As to Scoffing and jeering at my Person, 2. Scoffing Have you not deridingly called me the *Antifi* and *Rail- gnanus*, the *Goliab*, one that is *Philantia nimia inflatus*; viz. a proud conceited fellow, one guilty of notorious *Plagiarism* or *Thievery*, and *shameful Oscitancy* or *heedlessness*, all in the *Preface of Inf. Bapt.* And scoffingly to tell me, *Bernardus non vidit omnia*; That I am not such a sarr as taken to be, *Inf. Bapt.* p. 89. A *Hagin-Mastix*, a *sever Lasher*, *Ibid.* That I am a *Zemippe*, and a *Mummi*, a *meer Carper*, *Vind.* Scoffingly reflecting upon the *Exploits* or *Feats done in the daies of my Colonelship*, *Ibid.* p. 93. That you have discovered my *Mummery*, and plucks off the mask of my *Vizard*, *Pref. Vind.* and much more of this kind.

2. As to my *Book*, That it is a pompous Piece, very fallacious and contradictory, heape up with forgeries and prevarications, swelled with *Ses-*

# An Appeal to B. Wills Conscience.

*quipedalia verba; viz.* Words of a foot and half long or ridiculous stuff, p. 35. *Inf. Bapt.* The not-such, the Arguments therein consisting only of Trite out-worn things that have been trampled upon, and confused again and again, *Pref. Inf. Bapt.*

And thirdly, Whether in a Railing reviling manner you have not called me, *One possessed with a malevolent Spirit, and filled with envy*, p. 11. *Inf. Bapt.* *An unworthy Caviler*, p. 13. *Ibid.* *Of so much disingenuity as to traduce the sayings of worthy Men*, p. *Ibid.* *Impudent, silly, ridiculous*, p. 16. 2. part. *Ibid.* *One that will not refuse the most sordid and shameful waies to promote my opinion*, p. 37. *Ibid.* *A daring Champion*; and again, *A daring Person indeed*, p. 72. *Ibid.* *That I discover the ebullition of a malicious Spirit*, p. 106. *Ibid.* *Reflect the Monster Venarian Spirit upon me as one that is under Satanical delusion*, p. 99. *Ibid.* *One that prevaricates to free my self from prevarication*, p. 2. *Vind.* *That I have added contumacy to my mistakes*, *Pref. Vind.* *And that never Writer did more prevaricate and shew more falsehood then I have done*, p. 34. *Inf. Bapt.*

But, how such language can stand before the following Scriptures? is submitted to your Conscience; *viz.*

*Eph. 4. 31.* Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger and clamour, and evil speaking be put away from you with all malice, and be kind one to another, tender hearted.

*Prov. 15. 1.* A soft answer turneth away wrath, but grievous words stir up anger.

*Tit. 3. 2.* Speak evil of no Man, *Tim. 33.* not a brawler; *1. Cor. 5. 10.* If any that is called a Brother be a railer, with such a one do not eat.

*Matth.*

Matth. 3. 22. *Whoever is angry with his Brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the Judgment; and whoever shall say unto his brother Raca, shall be in danger of the Council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of Hell fire.*

Thirdly, I desire you to consider whether you are not evidently guilty of *False accusation*, and notorious *false speaking*.

First, in that general charge, *That never Writer did more prevaricate, or was guilty of more falsehood than my self* (what! none of the *Papish* *Legendaries*?) whereas in both your Books you have not been able to make out any one that is significant; for after you have done your utmost to make good such a thing, what doth it amount more then to discover the mistaking of 2 or 3 Names, and not rendring that passage in *Walden*, so much to my advantage as it was, none of which can possibly be judged willful mistakes, nor be truly charged with *fingery* or *prevarication*, which must needs therefore return upon you, according to the Rule *Deut. 19. 16, &c.*

Secondly, in those many particular falsehoods you have so positively charged upon me; viz. 1. That *I misrepresented Dr. Taylor, and dealt deceitfully in those Quotations out of his liberty of Prophecy*, as p. 35. *Inf. Bapt.* whereas the quite contrary is manifest, as p. 51, &c. of my Reply.

Secondly, That *I produced Durandus, a persecutor of Anabaptists, as a Witness for them*, p. 143. *Inf. Bapt.* when it is most manifest I do the quite contrary, p. 142, *Treaty*.

Thirdly, that I do bring *Jerom*, to lay *Jacob words* upon the 28. *Matthias* whereas you say, they are

are words of my own adding, and none of *Jeroms*; and yet I tell you he saith it, p. 166. *Vind.* whereas I have made good to you they are *verbatim Jeroms* own words upon that place.

Fourthly, That I produce *Gulielmus* from the *Magdeburgs*, for saying the *Virgin Mary* should be added to the words of Baptism; which you say is a notorious untruth, and that the *Magdeburgs* say nothing of the *Virgin Mary*, p. 185. *Vind.* And which I have expressly proved, and made good to a tittle as before.

Fifthly, you accuse me for abusing *Dr. Hamond* in that Quotation, on the 13. of *John 10*, making him speak quite otherwise then he doth; Satyrically deriding me for the same, p. 171. of your *Vind.* whereas I have made good to you that I did the Doctor no injury, but quoted his words truly and faithfully.

Sixthly, You accuse me, for saying, that the *Magdeburgs* say, that the *Apostles* only Baptized the adult or aged, Ch. 7. p. 2. *Inf. Bapt.* which you say is false; whereas I said no such thing, as p. 31. of *Reply* is demonstrated: and though I called for satisfaction again and again, yet you in your *Preface* to your Appeal justified, your self and severely reprove me for a tenacious and unreasonable Person, for not falling under your charge, what an evidence it is of my obstinacy; whereas my words were only these, That the *Magdeburgs* tell us, that they find the adult or aged were only Baptized; viz. in the Scripture Instances and Examples that they produce: And yet there you have the confidence to tell me it is alone, nay makes more against me; To which I say let it make for or against me, that is nothing to the falsehood you

you fastened upon me, I say, none of these words, neither doth it make at all against me; for they may find Scripture Instances only for the adult, and yet believe, as you grant, they did Baptize others then the adult, being two different things; but you tell me the word [*they find only such*] implied their certainty of the assertion, which they were so far from believing that they tell us, it appeared from the Apostles Writings, that they did not exclude Infants from Baptism; and at another time, p. 53. *Vind.* you tell me they say that *Origen* and *Cyprian* tell us, that Infants were Baptized in the Apostles daies; but what then do either of those Instances produce any Scripture Example for the Baptizing of an Infant or any other, but the adult; which serves only to evince that had I said, what you would have me say I had not so fairly represented them; viz. that they did only Baptize the adult, they believing with you, though upon as little ground, that Baptized the Infants also. But in as much as I said they said they found (*viz.* in those Scripture Instances) Examples only for the one, and not for the other; I faithfully and truly represented them, and you did injuriously and untruly represent me, and for which instead of giving me satisfaction, you still justify your self; and for your better conviction read what I have further said hereof before.

Seventhly, For your false and injurious charging me for producing *Munz'r* and *John of Leyden* for my Witnesses, to prove against Infants Baptism, scoffingly telling me, that you will quietly permit me to enjoy the comfort and honour of such Witnesses; p. 154. *Vind.* whereas I produce them not as any  
of

of my Witnesses, but reflect upon their story, as I tell you p. 145. Reply: First, to *show the unreasonableness of charging the Innocent with the crimes of such as are guilty.* And secondly, to *Examine that matter of fact, and how proved, upon which so much obliquity hath been cast upon the Anabaptists, and there may ever since; and both of which I conceive was fairly and modestly done by me in that 4. Chapter.*

Eightly, You scoffingly tell me, that my *invention will not serve me, to say any thing against one of the Waldenses Confessions for Infants Baptism, viz. that of Angrogne An. 1535. viz. As we promised when we were Baptized, being little ones, p. 121. which is a notorious falsehood, for I expressly speak to it, Treaty p. 310. And which afterwards he is fain to confess, p. 122. Vind. saying, that Mr. D. tells us p. 313, that these words bring Baptized when little ones were fostered into the Article, which I also there make good.*

4. Slandering For-  
eign Ana-  
baptists.

Secondly, You so falsely and slanderously accusing the *Anabaptists*, both forreign and domestick, that you might the better bring contempt upon them, and their cause, viz.

First, as to the Forreign *Anabaptists*, you charge those first Commotions, in *Swevia*, and *Munster*, to be *Anabaptistical*, p. 102, &c of you *Inf. Bapt.* the quite contrary upon due Examination is manifested, p. 146 of my Reply, and now unanswered by you.

Secondly, That the *Anabaptists, who were burnt, drowned and starved in Switzerland, was for perjury, disobedience, and sedition; and not for Anabaptistry, p. 79. Inf. Bapt.* the contrary whereto is fully manifested from the *Decree*

themselves, which are word for word given you, and by what *Gessius* and *Hornberk* say in confirmation thereof; viz. for their judgement of *Rebaptization*, as appears p. 152 of *Rep.* and *Treat.* p. 260, where the Edicts themselves are expressed.

Thirdly, For charging those in *Germany* to be so universally wicked and immoral, p. 200. whereas the contrary was made good to you from *Beza's* words, viz. That many of the *Anabaptists* are good Men, Servants of God, Martyrs of Christ, and our most dear B<sup>r</sup>. in his Ep. to the *Gallo-Belgick* Churches at *Embsen*, as *Repl.* p. 151. Besides the account of many 1000 of them that as Faithful Martyrs sealed the truth with their Blood, as *Treat.* 236, &c. appears to you.

Fourthly, That their principles were heretical and blasphemous, p. 94. &c. whereas from their confessions of Faith themselves, it is manifest they held the same with the *Waldenses*, as appears p. 154. *Rep.*

Fifthly, That the *Minists*, those *Holland Anabaptists* were for resistance of in affinity with the *Munster* satanical delusion, which put them upon such exorbitances, p. 99. whereas the quite contrary is said of them, and known to be their constant practise, refusing to bear Armes, or to carry so much as a Gun in their Ships, as p. 147, &c.

Secondly, as to our *English Anabaptists*, have you not in like manner powred reproach upon them, by your notorious false accusations, viz.

First, You stick not to say, that those who are inclinable to their way, are now grown so politick as not to profess the Faith till warm weather, i.e.

2. Still  
drive En-  
glish Ana-  
baptists

## An Appeal to M. Wills Conscience.

frugly telling us, that many last Summer were dipped in our parts, and in all likelyhood we may hear of many more this Summer, Preface to Infants Bapt.

The falshood and slander whereof is refused by known experience.

Secondly, neither are you ashamed to lay blasphemy and immorality to the charge of diverse Anabaptists in our own Nation, p. 95. implying, as I told you in my Reply p. 151. that the rest lore with them, otherwise, why is it mentioned, as I told you, challinging you to produce one Man of those divers Persons that is truly to be charged with your due proofs for the same; or else to be esteemed as truly you ought to be a false accuser of the Brethren, which notwithstanding you have neither done in your last Book, nor taken shame for your sin and folly therein.

Thirdly, and that above all you have not been affrayed to charge the Principle of Anabaptistry it self, viz. *To be of a dangerous nature*: Your words are these, *That you may safely affirm that is a Doctrine to be suspected false, which is usually attended with gross miscarriages in the Professors of it; for that bespeaks it ominous and like a spiritual Judgement of God upon it*: And, I heartily wish, say you, *there were no ground to say that of such a nature is the Doctrine of Baptizing grown Persons, in opposition to that of the Inf. Seed of Believers, for not to insist upon. The horrid errors and wicked lives of those in Germany, and blasphemies and immoralities of diverse in our own Nation.* [that being taken for granted, it seems to be undoubted proof in confirmation hereof] And that as some Men hold it (*viz. that*  
Baptism

Baptism is a boundary of Communion ) is of such a disquieting tendency, that it is not fit for any age or state of the Church. And as soon as Men become Baptists ( as they call themselves, affecting as you say that name ) they fall off from Godly Ministers, &c as an effect (as you reflect) of ignorance and pride, and to the scandal and shame of Christian Religion, p. 94, 95. And in your Preface you tell us with Mr. Sydnham, that the opinion of Antipædobaptism hath been alwaies ominous, and of a wonderful strange influence, to destroy Unity and Peace amongst Christians, accompanied also with the most retinue of errors, since the first Embrio of it was brought forth, whether by a secret judgement of God, or from the natural and secret connexion with other Principles of darkness, will not with Mr. Sydnham determine (oh wonderful Charity!) only God hath shewed some black Characters of it in every Nation, where it hath prevailed.

And, Men of this opinion so inflexible, that never any of them was heard to change his opinion, unless to some worse error, ( and how can that well be, if this be true that you have affirmed ) But, what can be spoken more venacious, more false, and repugnant to truth and common honesty, and more favouring of a malicious mind, is left to your Conscience to determine; Entreating you seriously to consider how such dealing can stand before these following Scriptures,

Exod. 20. 16. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy Neighbour.

23. 1. Thou shalt not receive a false report, put not thy hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness.

### An Appeal to Mr. Wills Conscience;

It being one of the things the Lord hates and abominates, as viz. Prov. 6. 19. *A false witness that speaketh lies, and him that soweth discord amongst Brethren.*

Prov. 15. 18. *He that beareth false witness against his Neighbour is a maul, and a sword, and and a sharp Arrow.*

Prov. 19. 9. *A false witness shall not be unpunished, and he that speaketh lies shall not escape.*

Deut. 19, 16, 18. *If a false witness rise up against any man to testify against him that which is wrong—the Judges shall make diligent search; and behold, if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his Brother, then shall you do unto him as he had thought to have done unto his Brother: so shalt thou put the evil away from among you: Which I shall conclude with that serious word, Dr. Stubb speaks to Mr. B. upon like occasion, and which I desire you to lay to heart: “If he be a slanderer, who wrongs his Neighbours credit, either by unjust railing, or upholding an evil report against him, surely you have cause to lay your hand upon your heart, and to take shame to you self. And if this be the mark of those that shall dwell in the Lords Tabernacle, that they are such that neither raise nor take up a reproach against their Neighbour, Psal. 15, 3. What will become of You [Mr. Wills] and where, & with whom must you dwell to Eternity, if God do not humble you, for your slanderous and lying Tongue and Pen?*

**F. Prevarication.**

Fourthly, are you not truly found guilty of Prevarication, in many particulars, the thing you so notoriously and falsely charge upon me, which is according to your own definition, p.

2. Vind.

## An Appeal to M. Wills Conscience.

y. Vind. To conceal what ought to have been declared on purpose to deceive; And of which I shall give you a few of many Instances that might be produced, viz.

First, Is it not manifest, as I have undenyably proved ( and in your own word by Mathematical Demonstration ) that you left out so many of the most considerable passages of the Waldensian Confessions, as p. 45. 2 part Inf. Bapt. and for which you have given no satisfaction, though you was so earnestly called upon by my self, as well as Mr. Tombes for the same.

Secondly, by leaving out part of that Confession you took out of Bishop Usher, p. 119. Vind. which Hoveden calls the Waldenses, I the Popish Inquisitors, you only taking part of it, which declares for Infant Baptism to save them; and yet you can tell us at another time, that the Waldenses affirmed that it profited them not for salvation. That the better to hide the cheat can now tell us in their excuse, that this was a dark time 500 years since; but in the mean time conceal that other part, which bespeaks it wholly Popish; viz. for the Mass, Popish-Priesthood, Real presence, Penance; &c. which Usher is so faithful to give, and which I have at large discovered to Mr. B. your Partner, in that evil, p. 84. a Reply.

Thirdly, by repeating every syllable of that Quotation p. 169. Vind. called Calvins; yet leaving out the last Clause Estius Annot. on Gen. 17. 7. which you know is there, as Treaty p. 176. Vind. And yet so often upraid me for not calling it Estius's, not only in your first Book, but 3 times, and very unmercifully too in your last,

### An Appeal to Mr. Wills Conscience.

Fourthly, by *Concealing* so much of the *Translation* of that out of *Calvins Institutes*, that you might the better *deceive* your *English Reader*, and make him believe it was the *Objection of Fools*, and not owned by *Calvin himself*, which his next words, as I have demonstrated and you very well knew, doth.

Fifthly, by that injurious dealing with me in that Quotation of mine from *Spanhamius*, and *Osiander* p. 326. of my Treat you only take notice of what *Spanhamius* speaks to part leave out what I say *Osiander saith* to the rest, and reprove me for my mistake, p. 104. *Inf. Bapt.* and though I called upon you in my *Reply*, for *satisfaction*, *Pref.* and p. 148. yet you return me not one syllable in your last.

Sixthly, by that injurious leaving out what you in your first p. quot from my 20. p. of *Reply*, which speaks it to be quite an other thing than you make it to be, and thereupon charge me with *prevarication*, if not *madness and contradiction*, which was an ill beginning that you should so stumble at the threshold; as though I quoted *Austin*, and those Antients downwards to prove that the practise of *Inf. Bapt.* was not in those *Centuries*, when I say the quite contrary, and tell you expressly that I quote them only for their sayings, which *speak so fully for Adult Baptism only*, contrary to their expresse practise. And then by affirming again and again that I contradicted my self in owning the Antients were for *Infants Baptism*, and denying there was *Antiquity* for it, whereas the foregoing words in my 19. p. enumerates them from *Austin*, and not the Antients of the former Centuries, whom I claim for *Believers Bapt.* only.

Seventhly, by the like injurious *dealing with me*, p. 57. Vind. taking part of a saying of mine in *Treat.* p. 101. and leaving out the next following words in p. 102. rendring me thereby ridiculous, and then call me at your pleasure, when I am so wholly innocent in the matter; viz. I justify my self in my *Reply* p. 36. from that falsehood you charge upon me, supposing me to say, that dipping was changed into Sprinkling the 3. Centurie, when I only say that the *Magdeb.* do tell us; that many corruptions about Bapt. was creeping in amongst the rest I mentioned (as I saw cause) that of Cyprians Letter to Magnus about Sprinkling, for dipping. But withall do say, they tell us they do not find any one person was then Baptized with any of their corrupt Ceremonies, having indeed, as they say, no authentik proof of the Baptizing of any one person; whereby I say it may be conjectured their corruptions were then more in the notion then practise, which afterwards came all of them to be in use.

You are pleased to repeat my former words about their beginning to alter the forme from dipping to sprinkling, and leave out all my latter words both what I so fully speak in the *Treat.* and my *Rep.* also. And then as p. 51. I suppose, Reader, thou hast seldom met with the like ridiculous contradiction in any Author—— So that he is the Man that hath cause to be ashamed, and is found very unfaithfull in speaking forwards and backwards at his pleasure; yea, that which is manifestly false, and then denying in the same breath, so adding one falsehood to another.

And therefore whilst you judge me so worthy of reproof for prevarication (though not at all proved

## On Appeal to 99. Wills Conscience

proved by you and you your self so guilty thereof, as so fully evidenced doth not this following Scripture concern you?

Rom. 2. 1. 23. Therefore thou art inexcusable, O Man, whosoever thou art that judgest, for wherein thou judgest thou condemnest thy self, for thou that judgest doest the same thing.

But, we are sure the judgement of God is according to truth against them, which commit such things, And thinkest thou this, O Man, that judges them, which do such things and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgement of God,

Verse 21. Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thy self, thou that preachest, a Man should not steal, dost thou steal. So thou that teachest a Man should not prevaricate, why art thou guilty of so much prevarication, and so self judged and condemned therein?

5. Forger-  
ry.

And fifthly, is it not evident that you are hanously guilty of Forgery, viz. pretending Authors say so and so, when they say no such thing, or the quite contrary.

Of which I shall give you few Instances.

First, do not you affirm p. 45. Vind. that Walden sheweth from Wickliffe's works that he was for Infants Baptism; whereas he abundantly saith the quite contrary, and your own Pen is constrained at another time to acknowledge, as p. 125, 172. Vind.

Secondly, do not you positively affirm, that Austin saith in his third Book De Anima, c. 13. that Vincentius Villor his opinion was that Infants the dyed Baptized went immediately to Heaven; whereas there is no such thing said, either in that or any other Chapter that I can find.

Thirdly

Thirdly, do not you say that *Rainerius* in the Catalogue of the *Waldensian* errors brings out one word of their denying *Inf. Bapt.* as p. 67. *Inf. Bapt.* whereas he expressly saith in that Catalogue, that they affirmed *Inf. Bapt.* was nothing worth, and that *Gossips* that undertook for them knew not what they did; for which see *Rep.* p. 125. 131.

Fourthly, do now affirm that Dr. Taylor in his Book called *Consideration of the Practice of the Church*, and Dr. Hamond in his *Letter of Resolutions*, had given answer to those Arguments produced by me, out of his *Liberty of Prophecy* against *Infants Baptism*, as p. 36, 37, 98 of your *Infants Baptism*; whereas in p. 53, &c. of my Reply, it is fully made out from both their words, that they do confirm those Arguments to be good that are therein brought against the principle Arguments, the *Pedobaptists* bring for that their practice.

Fifthly, do not you produce *Basil*; to be an Eminent witness for *Infants Baptism* in the fourth Century, as p. 136. Whereas there is never such a word to be found in any of *Basil's* writings that doth yet appear.

Sixthly, you do positively affirm from the acquaintance you had with Father *Basil* that he in his third Book *Contr. Unomian* in the very next lines after those words I had repeated of that quotation, declared himself to be for *Infants Baptism*. And for my omitting the same, call upon the Reader to have a care henceforward how they trust my quotations for the palpable abuse done to that Father, and for a fallacy and fallhood upon the Reader, p. 13. *Inf. Bapt.* And again in his Preface, charging me for mistaking and leaving out

\*You charged me not for misquoting, but for partially quoting and misapplying it, but could not direct to the page.

part of that Sentence of Basil. About which I got a Friend first to write to you, to know where to find it: to which you replied, that \* for which manifest injury done to Basil and me, also in that your severe Reflection, I called for satisfaction, as p. 48. Reply. But all that I can get yet from you is this, that you mistook only a name Basil for Nazianzen, p. 61. Vind. Equilizing my mistake of Albertus for Aquinas with it, p. 183.

Which I cannot take for due pay: First, because it was not a bare slip in haste, but a thing justified by you in cold blood when I gave you time to deliberate upon it, by sending so civilly to you that you might have an opportunity to rectify it, or clear your self.

Secondly, by your extenuating it, as though it was just like my mistaking, Albertus for Aquinas, which I can by no means admit for that was a quotation for you to prove for Infant Bapt, which cannot demonstrate any wilfulness in me, nor that I could have any end in the mistake, nor was it improved to your prejudice, whereas that of yours was a great proof against me, highly boasted of by you to discover your reading and acquaintance with that Father, and improved much to my disgrace, and often and very severely inculcated upon me. Therefore I do expect from you more fuller satisfaction therein, and your due humiliation for such a notorious miscarriage.

As well for your vainglorious boast as your trampling so upon me.

Seventhly, in like manner was your dealing about what you own to be your mistake, only of a Century respecting Peter Beir p. 53. Inf. Bapt. out of Osiander, which was not only so, but

the sever lashes you gave me about it; viz. That you see by this that when Men are engaged in a Cause, and wedded to an opinion, they will not refuse the most sordid and shameful waies to promote it: fall in with slanderous Papists, and take up what they say to defend their opinions; witness my Antagonist. And at this rate you go on chastising of me, and all upon your own gross surgery and mistake: For which Sir, I expect your repentance, you did not mistake a Century only, but Christianly, Civility, and Common Honesty also, and you did not only abuse me, but *Osiander Clavicornis*, *Peter Brou*, and yet have you the confidence to tell me p. 131. that you could retort upon me, that I belyed Calvin, I belyed the Truth, and by that surgery, I would cover, and bid, and abuse the World with a cheat, and much more, my own Conscience, by that piece of folly and falsehood.

Whereas is now manifestly appears that I did put *Estius* his name to the Quotation: and therefore there could be neither cheat, abusing of the World, forgery, nor falsehood in the matter, which doth but heighten your crime, and makes more work for Repentance, which I also duly call for from you.

And therefore to further, the same desire you to read and consider the following Scriptures.

Lev. 19. 11. *Thou shalt not lie one to another.*

Prov. 14. 5. *A faithful witness will not lie, but a false witness uttereth lies.*

Eph. 4. 25. *Wherefore putting away lying speak every Man truth with his Neighbour.*

Col. 3. 9. *Lie not one to another.*

Psal. 119. 69. *The proud hath forged lies.*

Jer. 9. 3. *They bend their tongues like bows for lies, but are not valiant for the truth.*

With

## An Appeal to *God*. With Conscience.

With the Scriptures before mentioned, Rom. 2. 1, 2, 3, 21. *Because you have proclaimed me such a sinner, and judged me for the same, but have yet made no proof thereof.*

6. *Mistranslation.*

And sixthly, are not you guilty of *Mistranslation*, and *Misreading Authors*. For Instance;

First, That notorious passage about the *Ministers*, which you translate quite contrary to *Truth*, viz. that they were for *Resistance* in the *Minister* way, and for *destroying* the wicked by force of *Armes*, in order to the setting up the *Kingdom of Christ*, p. 99. of *Inf. Bapt.* when the quite contrary is there said and the constant knowledge of their principles and practice evinceth.

Secondly, for *Misreading* that passage out of *Calvins Institutes*, before accounted for in the appeal to be the objection of fools, when *Calvin* owns the same to be his Judgement.

Thirdly, for *Misreading* a passage out of *Austin* 3. B. de *Anima*, saying that upon *Vincentius Victor*, that is not there said of him.

Fourthly, for translating *βρὺς*, to signify only an *Infant* without understanding, p. 11. *Inf. Bapt.* when the contrary is true, as appears 2 *Tim.* 3, 4. *Thou hast known the holy Scriptures a Child, there is the same word.*

7. *Hypocrisis.* Lastly, whether your solemn Appeal to the Searcher of hearts, that you have no malignity to my Person, having ground to hope I am a Godly Man; and in your Preface to *Vind.* that you love me as a Brother though erring, and had much rather convince than shame me, can be well reconciled to sincerity, and not rather speaking lies in hypocrisy: when it is considered, First,

how you have declined all fair Brotherly waies  
of

of receiving Satisfaction, choosing rather in this publick manner to *reproach* and *slander* me upon hear-say: 2. *Jeer* and *Scoff* at me: 3. to *Raile* upon and *Revile* me in that unchristian manner you have done, speaking so much *evil* of me *falsly*: 4. proclaiming me with your *Associates* in the *Gazette* and in the *Catalogues* (where you know I cannot follow you for my vindication) 5. And at last so groundlessly, disorderly, not to say maliciously, to Appeal to the *Baptists* against me, as a person that has added contumacy to my mistakes and evils.

All which is recommended to your Conscience in the sight of God, (and all that are conscientiously concerned with you) leaving it to your choice, which of your promises you will keep, whether that in the conclusion of your first *Prof. Vind.* To answer me by silence, because you will not gape against an Oven: Or that in the end of your last *Preface*, viz. That if I can make it appear that you have wronged me herein, as you can truly say you did in not willingly: So you faithfully promise to make me publick satisfaction, by acknowledging your mistakes.

---

F I N I S

# ERRATA.

PAGE 9. l. ult. r. enjoyed, p. 10. l. 28. r. Rhinast, p. 14. l. 32. r. obloquy, p. 18. l. 13. dele rde, and the Commas at Doctor, l. 23. r. to speak, l. 26. r. words, p. 19. l. 28. r. by them, p. 21. l. 15. dele that, p. 29. l. 27 r. ought so to do, p. 38. l. x. r. radact, p. 41. l. 16 & 19. r. Aquinas, p. 51. l. 19. r. philanthia, p. 52. l. 2. r. malevolent, l. 17. r. Master and, p. 55. l. 21. r. that they, l. 32. r. for, p. 63. l. 23. dele of, p. 67. l. 19. r. every, l. 27. r. vintibus, p. 70. l. 12. r. Offender, p. 73. l. 8. for do now t. do not you, l. 27. r. Eusebiam, p. 74. l. 2. r. Navianen, equalizing, 119. add 18. r. Aquinas.

I desire the Reader, where I mention to Mr. Will's (in p. 2, Pref. and p. 51. & 53.) the mistakes I own, not to understand it exclusive of those few slight and immaterial ones not mentioned there, as that of the Canon of Constant, which I my self found to be spurious, that of Chrysostom's not being in a different Character, my translating the passage of Navianen, metaphorically, putting Zenaras for the Magdeburgs; that of Mr. Baxter's, work, for be no such cause.

## A POSTSCRIPT by H. D.

**F**OR the Readers better and more full satisfaction (after the great cry against me for Forgery and prevarication by my Antagonists) I have here given you together, this brief account of all the mistakes of moment that I have met with from any hand. And which the Reader is desired to correct in the Treatise as he meets with them; which are as followeth; viz.

1. Of my own or Friends discovery, p. 55. 56. for Eastern r. Western, p. 139. for Erasmus r. Beza, p. 124. dele what is produced from Lanfrank about Beringarius, and p. 68. and 115. and Index, dele the Canon of the Council of Constant. as spurious.
2. Of Mr. Banters finding out, p. 223. for 3 & 4 book against the Donatists r. 4 book, p. 286. 294. for Cocblew r. Walden.
3. Of Mr. Willis, p. 75. for Aquinas r. Albertus, p. 116. dele Deodanz, and for Hincmarus r. Sericius, p. 117. r. Magdeburgs for Zonaras, p. 155. for work no such cause r. be no such cause, p. 287. dele Pelagius and Vincitius Victor.

These being all the errors of any weight I have yet met with from any: The judicious Reader will be more able to discern;

1. Whe-

## A Postscript by H. D.

\* To lead from the main question to things not to the purpose, and make a heavy stir about them, is the right method of Cavillers; and which my Opposites take with me in this controversy.

1. Whether there be any Forgery or Prevarication, or any wilful abuse, or misleading the Reader, (as with so much violence suggested) or any other oversight or mistakes, then such as usually attend other writings; and therefore whether all the clamour and out-cry of my Antagonists, discovers not more of malice then matter, and is the result rather of prejudice and passion, then a zeal for the candid investigation of truth.

2. Whether since the Exceptions appear to be so insignificant and immaterial to the great point contended about, and no weightier objections were good after so severe a scrutiny, and troubling the World with the dust and pudder made about them, the Question in debate be not fully given up, viz. That it is now clearly manifest, that there is no Primitive Antiquity for Infants Baptism, nor no Record to make it appear that it was practised as Christs Ordinance for the first 300 years; The truth whereof having not only been evinced by answered Arguments and Demonstration; but from their own Pens, being constrained at last to acknowledge, That except in case of danger of Death, there is no Record in the History of the Church for the necessity thereof in these first times.

Therefore the Reader is desired to take notice what ground we get herein, and how far this consideration tends to justify our practice, viz.

1. That the Baptizing of Believers, after profession of Faith, is not only evidenced by express precept and example from the Scripture; (the true and only way whereby Christs Ordinances are established to Protestants;) but by the universal consent of all Ages; our very Enemies being Judges.

2. That

## A Roscript by E. D.

22. That the Baptizing of Infants is neither to be made good by any express precept or practice from Scripture; nor is an Apostolical Tradition for these first and purest times; as our Adversaries also acknowledge; though they would insinuate as if they could consequentially deduce it; whereas no natural nor un-fore'd consequence can be infer'd in its favour from Scripture or primitive Antiquity, but absurd and illogical non-sequiturs, proving nothing so much as the weakness of the cause they endeavour to support.

So that it necessarily and undeniably follows, That though Papists and some Protestants may plead Antiquity since the 9th. Century; and no higher (the Milevitan Synod that first imposed it, being in the year 456.) for the necessity of Baptizing of Children to take away Original sin, regenerate and save their Souls, with the Concomitants of Chrysm, Exorcism, Gossips, &c. Yet the Protestants with whom we have to do (owning this to be a poisonous Anachristian Doctrine) cannot pretend higher for their Christning Children upon the account of sacerdotal right than the 15th. or 16th. Century. And that therefore (they rejecting the grounds of the Ancients) their Infants Baptism upon this new Medium is a very novelty. So that I hope we shall hear no more of Antiquity for Infants Baptism of any sort.

And 3ly, that it yet undeniably appears, that a famous Wonders has been born for Believers and against Infants Baptism in the successive Ages since Christ.

And as a further ratification of the truth of these things pleaded for betwixt us in this contest, it may not be unnecessary to mind the Reader the sense that

\*which so-  
vil Argu-  
ment of sa-  
dral right  
is excel-  
lently re-  
futed by Dr.  
Ed. Har-  
chinson.

## A Postscript by H. D.

that some standers by have given by their suffrages, both as to the manner and matter pleaded for, which you have exemplified in the learned and judicious disquisitions of Mr. Hurchinson in his late Reflections and Animadversions upon Mr. Baxter, Mr. Wills, and Whiston's Writings. The Letter of Mr. T. B. to Mr. Wills, the Epistle of Mr. Tho. DeLaune before Mr. Hurchinson's; all of them so great strangers to me, that I neither ever saw any of their Faces, or so much as heard of their names that I know of, before their said works.

And to which I may presume to add a Letter sent to me upon this occasion, by a person of Quality, a searcher into this Controversie, and one of known worth, abillity, and moderation; which you may take as followeth.

S I R,

As to Mr. Baxters Piece ( which so soon as I heard of, I forthwith sent for ) I have cursorily run over, especially that part thereof, which more immediately concerns your self, and am sorry to see so much *Rancor* and *Malice* in the writings of one who hath had so great a Name for *Religion* and *Piety*: But whether will not *Pride*, *Passion*, and an *Over-weening Opinion* of a mans self carry those who are over come by them?

When I first read your *Treatise of Baptism*, I hoped it would have occasioned a *serious* and *full Disquisition* of that point; but whether through the *unhappy* temper of your *Opponents*, or what else I know not, I have been hitherto *disappointed* in my expectation, meeting in their writings with

A Postscript by H. D.

with more of *best passion and personal reflection*,  
then of *Reason* or a *sober Inquisition* after Truth.

I am not so well vers'd in *Antiquity*, as to say  
when *Infant Baptism* first came in use amongst  
*Christians*; but admire a matter of fact only,  
as that is, should be so difficult to be determin-  
ed: But if it were not in all, or at least the  
first and purest Ages of *Christianity*, (as some  
learned *Pedobaptists* seem to grant it was not)  
it cannot be said to be of *Apostolical Tradition*;  
the best plea, if true, I have yet heard for it;  
and therefore I could wish that Point had been  
*soberly and calmly* debated. I must confess, I  
know not of any *difference* amongst *Professors*  
of more *unhappy* and *pernicious* Consequence  
than this of *Baptism*, in regard of that *separa-*  
*tion* and *Division* it causes amongst *Learned, sin-*  
*cere, and truly Pious Christians*; for such I no  
ways doubt but there are of both persuasions.  
But 'tis matter of greatest trouble and sorrow  
to me, to see with what *uncharitable* and *un-*  
*christian Spirits* some men manage this Contro-  
versie, even to the reproach and scandal of Re-  
ligion, and this too in a day, when our com-  
mon sufferings ought in prudence, if not for  
Piety sake to unite us; at least in *Brotherly love*,  
and a *Christian Walking* together so far as we  
have *attained*, and in other things to a Patient  
waiting for the *Revelation* of the mind of God,  
to them that differ; who in his good timewill,  
I doubt not, *Unite our Affections, Heal our*  
*Breaches*, and make us *all but one Sheep-fold*,  
under the great Shepherd of the Sheep *Christ*  
*Jesus*, to whose guidance and protection I  
most heartily recommend you, and for the pre-  
sent remain, &c.

And

# A Postscript by H. D.

And lastly, I hope the Baptists answer to Mr. Will's Appeal against me, will show no small tendency to issue this Controversie, whose diligent search (by those learned Men they appointed thereby) into the Authors quoted by me, and excepted against by him, will be a sufficient vindication (I doubt not) of my integrity in my Quotations, as well as the truth asserted thereby; and a due Reproof to Mr. Will for his great Temerity, being himself so eminently found guilty by them in so many things he so injuriously charges upon me, inasmuch that they (as he desires, in case my Innocency appears to them) as you see, have thought just to acquit me, and reflect the blame of the Charge upon himself: All which is again submitted to his Conscience, the Impartial Readers, and the blessing of the Almighty. By

H. D.

As I doubt not, but that the same will be a sufficient vindication of my integrity in my Quotations, as well as the truth asserted thereby; and a due Reproof to Mr. Will for his great Temerity, being himself so eminently found guilty by them in so many things he so injuriously charges upon me, inasmuch that they (as he desires, in case my Innocency appears to them) as you see, have thought just to acquit me, and reflect the blame of the Charge upon himself: All which is again submitted to his Conscience, the Impartial Readers, and the blessing of the Almighty. By

But, this matter of words is easily and soon known to me, or to any other man, and will not be a matter of words, but of fact. I have written to the man who made his Controversie, and he has answered me, and I have answered him, and this too in a day, when our common sufferings ought to be remembered, if not for the sake of mine, at least in brotherly love, and a Christian Walking together to further we have agreed, and in other things to a Patient waiting for the revelation of the mind of God, to them first, or who in his good timewill, I doubt not, will give us a full and satisfactory answer, and make us all but one flock, and one fold, the great shepherd of the sheep, and I will heartily recommend you all for the same.